



Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

BV 825 .H377

Harrison, John, 1815-1883.

An answer to Dr. Pusey's

Shelf..... challenge respecting the

AN ANSWER TO DR PUSEY'S CHALLENGE.

Itaque sermonem constituens vivificatorem, quia spiritus et vita sermo, eundem etiam carnem suam dixit; quia et sermo caro erat factus, proinde in causam vitæ appetendus, et devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus. TERTULLIAN 10 6.

ὅτε ἐμάχοντα πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες· πῶς δύναται ἡμῖν οὗτος δοῦναι τὴν σάρκα φαγεῖν; αποδείκνυμεν ὅτι οὐκ ἂν τοσοῦτον ἀνόητοι ἦσαν οἱ ἀκούοντες, ὥς ὑπολαμβάνειν ὅτι προκαλεῖται ὁ ἰσχυρὸς τοὺς ἀκροατ. s. εἰς τὸ προσελθεῖν καὶ ἐμφαγεῖν τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ. ORIGEN 11 3.

Si præceptiva locutio est, aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam iubens, non est figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. ‘Nisi ‘manducaveritis,’ inquit, ‘carnem Filii hominis et sanguinem biberitis, non ‘habebitis vitam in vobis;’ facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figura est ergo, precipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum, in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit. AUGUSTINE 21 13.

AN ANSWER TO DR PUSEY'S CHALLENGE

RESPECTING THE

DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE,

IN WHICH THE DOCTRINES OF THE LORD'S SUPPER,
AS HELD BY HIM, ROMAN AND GREEK CATHOLICS, RITUALISTS,
AND HIGH ANGLO-CATHOLICS,
ARE EXAMINED AND SHOWN TO BE CONTRARY TO THE
HOLY SCRIPTURES,
AND TO THE
TEACHING OF THE FATHERS OF THE FIRST EIGHT CENTURIES,
WITH THE TESTIMONY OF AN AMPLE *CATENA PATRUM*
OF THE SAME PERIOD.

BY

✓
JOHN HARRISON, D.D., EDIN.,

VICAR OF FENWICK, NEAR DONCASTER,

AUTHOR OF 'WHOSE ARE THE FATHERS?' 'AN ANTIDOTE TO THE TEACHING
OF CERTAIN ANGLO-CATHOLICS, &c.,' 'ON THE PRIMITIVE
MODE OF MAKING BISHOPS,' &c.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL I.

LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1871.

EDINBURGH :
PRINTED BY TURNBULL AND SPEARS.

THE PREFACE.

THE doctrine of the real presence in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, is the doctrine beyond all others of which High Anglicans and Ritualists make their boast. The press, the pulpit, and the platform are employed to herald it forth. Of its maintainers Dr Pusey is the first and foremost. The legal check which has been lately given to certain outward acts and bodily worship in connection with this doctrine, has tended to intensify zeal in its promulgation. Dr Pusey, although not one of the Ritualists has naturally enough become their defender, and has been accepted by them as such. The highest title which many of the Fathers were wont to confer on the Apostle Peter, and the name of the chief of all Homer's heroes, these Ritualists and Romanizers lavish upon Dr Pusey their leader. He explains his connection with this new movement as follows :—‘Although I have never ‘taken any part in the ritualist movement, I believed and ‘believe, that the object of that movement has been to set ‘before the eyes, Catholic truths in regard to the Holy ‘Eucharist which have been ever received in the Church.’ (35 58.) Since he made this statement, the Convocation of the Southern Province has attacked Ritualism, and Dr

Pusey, feeling the importance of his own position as the leader of this Romanizing movement in the Church, and not wishing to come under the censure of Convocation has interpreted that censure as applicable to the *acts* of the Ritualists, rather than to their *doctrines*. These doctrines he feels himself called upon to defend. After stating his own sentiments in regard to the Holy Eucharist, he thus concludes: 'Should it be decided by a competent authority that either the real objective presence, or the eucharistic sacrifice, or the worship of Christ there present (as I have above stated those doctrines) were contrary to the doctrine held by the Church of England, I would resign my office.' (35 65.) This bears date 'vigil of S. Matthias 1867.' In a letter inserted in the *Guardian*, dated July 20, 1868, Dr Pusey, alluding to this, says: 'I put forth my own belief not long ago, at the end of a sermon in reference to Dr Heurtley's strictures upon us *purposely as a challenge*.'

This challenge is now accepted, and the answer to it is given in the following pages.

Perhaps it may appear presumptuous to accept the challenge of a man of such reputed eminence as Dr Pusey, but it should be borne in mind that were he ten times greater than he really is, that need not deter a Christian man who loves to know what is the truth of God's Blessed Word and how devout and learned men of old understood it, from a personal, patient, and persevering investigation of both sources of evidence, and if he finds that the facts in either or both cases, are altogether different from those which are alleged by Dr Pusey, he

surely may state them without being deemed presumptuous. Truth and facts happily are independent alike of the greatness or of the littleness of men. The Pharisees doubtless from their position and reputation had many advantages over their brother member of the Synagogue who had been blind from his birth, but as the controversy between them turned upon matters of fact, and these were clearly on the side of the blind man, any supposable superiority of the Pharisees was impotent to change or to subvert the facts of which the man who had received his sight was happily too cognizant. For some time past High Anglicans have so steadfastly insisted that the Fathers teach their doctrines that the truer representatives of the Reformed Church of England now very generally concede that point. But such a concession is practically a contradiction of the most strongly advocated opinions of all the Reformers, our English Reformers not excepted, as is abundantly testified by their general writings published in the volumes of the Parker Society.

If it be said that Dr Pusey challenged his doctrine to be tried rather by some recognized tribunal of the Church than by the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers, the answer is, that if a single presbyter, in his private or assumed capacity, makes a challenge on any vital theological question, as in the present instance, surely any other presbyter who may have taken the trouble to put himself in possession of the facts and evidence of the case, may on the same grounds, accept the challenge, especially if he believes the doctrine in question to be directly contrary to the Holy Scriptures and the whole Catholic Church,

and is also convinced that his belief admits of a satisfactory demonstration to all readers who may be willing sincerely and candidly to weigh the evidence which he is able to adduce. To the judgment of such readers the author submits his answer to the challenge.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

CHAPTER I.—INTRODUCTORY.

	PAGE
Account of the Ritualists, and their confidence in the teaching of Dr Pusey. The Challenge formally stated. The Canon of Interpretation as held by High Anglicans, and their gross violation of it. The Fathers in appearance only favour the Romanists, but not in reality. Explanation of the <i>Catena Patrum</i> . Dr Pusey's unsatisfactory treatment of Patristic Testimony, and a statement of the manner in which it should be treated. The present Controversy unknown until the Ninth Century. The General Agreement of the Fathers on the Doctrine of the Eucharist. Their Difference of Opinion in regard to Allegorical Interpretations. Their imperfect Biblical Knowledge. Their loose manner of defending their Doctrines before Unbelievers. Their real views of Doctrine better obtained from their sober, than their Rhetorical Statements. The proper mode of treating their testimony. Their competency to give it.	1-18

CHAPTER II.

One of Dr Pusey's strange assertions considered. History of the Controversy respecting the Eucharist. Dr Pusey claiming Authors to be on his side when they are not really so. The right mode of interpreting Sacramental Language. Literal interpretation of the words of Institution considered. Dr Pusey at variance with himself. A knowledge of the original of the Old Testament essential to right interpretation of the New. Mistakes of the Fathers in consequence of not knowing the Hebrew Scriptures. An extraordinary instance of Dr Pusey's literal interpretation considered. A literal interpretation defined. The sacrifice of Christ neither repeated nor continued. An instance in which Dr Pusey violates his own rules, in not interpreting the Words of Institution after the Manner of a Will. How St Paul calls repeatedly the Consecrated Elements by the names of Bread and Wine. Dr Pusey again violating his own rules in not interpreting as literally as he pretends. The use of the word *Body* in relation to the humanity of Christ considered, and Dr Pusey's views of the Presence of that Body. Assumed by him and Mr Shipley that Christ's Body can be present everywhere, and in the smallest portion of the Consecrated Elements. Dr Pusey's unfounded assumption that Christ contrived and invented a mode

	PAGE
of the Presence of His Body nowhere revealed in Scripture, considered. Dr Pusey's miracle the most marvellous by way of accounting for the Real Presence in the Consecrated Elements shown to be without evidence and contrary to fact. A full statement of Dr Pusey's own marvellous literal interpretation of the Words of Institution. Instances in which both Dr Pusey and Roman Catholics interpret the same Words, or part of the same Words, of Institution also figuratively.	18-35

CHAPTER III.

The Words of Institution of the Lord's Supper in relation to the New Testament or Covenant examined and considered in connection with the use of the Word Covenant in the Old Testament, with an exposure of Dr Wiseman's and Dr Pusey's misinterpretation of the Word Covenant, and its true relation set forth as explanatory and illustrative of the figurative or elliptical character of the words, 'This Cup is the New Testament in My Blood.' The extreme difficulty which Believers in the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Consecrated Elements have in giving a consistent and harmonious interpretation to the Words of Institution in relation to the Cup. Cornelius a Lapide adduced as an instance. The Sacramental phraseology of the New Testament, more especially that of Baptism, considered as confirmatory and illustrative of the figurative language of the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper; wherein also is shown the misconceptions of High Church Anglicans in regard to the true doctrine of Baptism.	36-78
---	-------

CHAPTER IV.

The Words of Institution of the Jewish Passover examined and vindicated by the teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures, and by the Greek and Latin versions of the same, also by the unanimous testimony of the early Fathers as well as by modern Biblical Scholars, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, against the novel criticisms of Dr Wiseman, Dr Pusey, and Dr Wordsworth, the Bishop of Lincoln; and its true relation shown in regard to the Words of Institution in the Lord's Supper; with an exposure of the unfair treatment which Zwingle received at the hand of Dr Wiseman for maintaining the true and ancient interpretation of the words, 'It is the Lord's Pass-over,' and its application to the phrase, 'This is My Body.'	79-100
---	--------

CHAPTER V.

Dr Pusey's and Mr Makonochie's Doubtful Analogy between God making man a Living soul, and Divine power making the Conse-	
--	--

crated Elements the Body and Blood of Christ, considered and shown to be false. Dr Pusey's assumption that our Lord was born with a Spiritual Body, passed with it through a solid block of stone and closed doors, and subsists after the same manner in the Consecrated Elements proved to be unscriptural and heretical. His misapplication of a part of 1 Cor. x. 16-21 in favour of his doctrine corrected, and the whole shown not to be for, but against it. 101-110

CHAPTER VI.

The Teaching of Dr Hamilton, the late Bishop of Salisbury, and that of the Roman Catholic Church, on the Exclusive Priesthood of Bishops and Presbyters, and their being Real Sacrificers in the Lord's Supper, shown to be contrary to Holy Scripture and the Testimony of the Early Church. A Critical Examination of the phrase *to do*, as used in connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper, and shown to be misinterpreted and misapplied by the Bishop and others, in which is pointed out the unaccountable Misuse of certain texts cited in the original Hebrew, and as rendered in the LXX., Latin Vulgate, and English Version. The analogous use of the phrase *to do*, both in the Jewish and Christian Passover, considered and pointed out, and that as the chief actors in the Jewish Passover were not necessarily of the Priestly order, so neither were the chief actors in the Christian Passover necessarily of that order. As in the one case what was done was in remembrance of a past event, and not a perpetuation or repetition of it, so in the other the sacrifice of Christ our Passover Lamb, by whom we were delivered, is not perpetuated or repeated, but brought to remembrance. This illustrated and confirmed by Patristic testimony. Christ, so far from having any Exclusive Priestly representatives, having ministered and acted as a Priest once for all, has sat down, thereby showing that the office has been fulfilled, and therefore can need no Representatives, shown to be the doctrine of Scripture and that of the Early Church. Christ is not now taking away, or bearing sin as alleged; this, according to Scripture and Early Antiquity, was accomplished when He suffered on the Cross, and can neither be continued nor repeated, 111-135

CHAPTER VII.

A full Answer to Dr Wiseman's novel Criticism on John vi. Our Lord's Teaching respecting Himself as the Bread of Life, illustrated by other parts of the same Gospel. Dr Wiseman's Leading Objections to a Figurative Interpretation of our Lord's words, considered and answered. The Unsacramental character of the Discourse demonstrated. Its Arbitrary division by Dr Wiseman shown to be novel and unfounded. His rules of Interpretation considered to

be inapplicable and misapplied. The discourse and others in the same Gospel shown to be Prophetic, and not intended to be clearly understood until after our Lord's resurrection and ascension. The folly of Dr Pusey's advice to be content with the knowledge the disciples had respecting how Christ's Flesh was to be eaten before His Resurrection and Ascension, exhibited. His and Archdeacon Denison's assumption considered and answered, viz., that our Lord's discourse was on sacramentally eating His flesh and blood ; that the flesh and blood of Christ, according to the undoubted teaching of the Early Church, can be received otherwise than in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and must be so received before they can be received rightly in that Holy Ordinance. Dr Wiseman's literal Interpretation of our Lord's words proved to have been answered by anticipation by the unanimous consent of all antiquity. 136-180

CHAPTER VIII

The History of the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Consecrated Elements as first introduced by Paschasius refuted by Bertram, and partly by Rabanus Maurus : with a view of the Catholic doctrine before the controversy arose, as recorded in the writings of Rabanus Maurus, and more especially in those of Bede, the most famous Divine in the age in which he lived, and who compiled a Commentary taken out of the writings of Augustine. From this, copious comments are cited, more especially on those texts connected with the controversy, and from which may be seen not only the sentiments of Bede on the doctrine in question, but also those of Augustine. 181-231

CHAPTER IX.

An Examination of the leading Fathers of the first 450 years of the Christian era concerning the supposed Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Consecrated Elements. The words 'Real Presence,' or 'Presence,' in regard to the Eucharist, shown to be rather of Post-Reformation origin than Patristic. Dr Pusey's Faith stated in regard to the Real Presence and the Presence not Real. A full consideration of the word 'Mystery' and the equivalent word 'Sacrament.' The word Mystery shown to be employed by the Fathers in relation to the Rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in the same sense as it is employed in the New Testament, and its cognates in the same sense as they are used by the Heathen, which usage is shown to be incompatible with the Real Presence of Christ in the Consecrated Elements. The misapplication of the word 'Mysterious' and the word 'Mystery' understood in that sense shown to be misapplied to the Consecrated Elements, and the error corrected of Bishop Browne making it appear that Calvin and

Hooker favoured such a misapplication. Dr Pusey's use and abuse of such words as 'Spiritual Presence' and 'Present Spiritually' Considered and Answered, and the use of such words in Relation to Christ in the Eucharist shown to be of Post-Reformation Origin, and seldom, if ever, so used by the Fathers. The Marcionite Notion of Dr Pusey in regard to Christ's having at His Birth and Resurrection a Spiritual Body Examined and Refuted from the Fathers to whom he appeals. The Mistake pointed out of Arch-deacon Freeman in concluding on insufficient grounds that Bertram and Paschasius Radbert were of one mind in regard to the Doctrine on the Lord's Supper. The Doctrine of Mr Bennett on the Lord's Supper proved to be like that of Paschasius and not like that of Bertram and Ælfric, as Sir Robert Phillimore assiduously endeavours to prove. The Doctrine of Dr Pusey and Mr Shipley in regard to the Spiritual Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Consecrated Elements, Stated and Contrasted with the Doctrine of the Fathers, who speak very expressly of Christ's Real Spiritual Presence in regard to His Divinity, and in the same connection of the Real Bodily Absence of His Humanity until He comes a second time. The phrase of Ambrose, 'the Body of Christ is a Body of a 'Divine Spirit,' as interpreted by the Context and by Bertram, shown to afford no Real Help to Dr Pusey's Doctrine of Christ's Body being Present in the Consecrated Elements after the manner of a Spirit. The manner in which the Fathers use the words 'Spiritual' and 'Spiritually' shown to be fatal to such a Doctrine. The statements of the Fathers given in which they affirm that the wicked receive only the Sacrament of Christ's Body, the sign or Symbol only, but not the Reality, which is subversive of the Real Presence in the Consecrated Elements. Dr Pusey's novel invention of a third part in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, namely, Grace in addition to Sign and things Signified shown not to be correctly founded on the Church Catechism, nor on the teaching of Augustine, nor of the Fathers generally, inasmuch as they maintain that the things Signified cannot be received without the Grace or Virtue, nor the Grace or Virtue without the thing Signified. The citations made by Dr Pusey from Augustine to prove that the wicked in receiving the Consecrated Elements do also really receive in them Christ's Body and Blood, illustrated by Augustine's own Plain Teaching, and proved to Teach no such Doctrine. Some of the Reasons stated why Romanists Appeal to the General Testimony of the Fathers in favour of their Doctrines, with an Examination and Exposure of the Abortive Attempt of the Roman Catholics in the Corpus Juris Canonici to reconcile the Plain Teaching of Augustine with that of Paschasius and his Disciples on the Lord's Supper. 232-346

CHAPTER X.

A more Critical Examination of the Fathers in regard to their use of Figurative Language which they commonly use in relation to the

Eucharist, and a Full Examination of the General Rules according to which their Language must be Interpreted. The ancient definition of a Sacrament, as given by Augustine, considered and compared with that of the Post-Reformation, as given in the Church of England Catechism. Dr Pusey's Misrepresentation and Misapplication of the Modern Definition, which is shown to be Zwinglian in its Origin. The fact that the Fathers, like the Holy Scriptures, commonly call Signs and Sacraments by the names of the things of which they were the Signs and Sacraments confirmed and fully illustrated. The disposal of Dr Pusey's slender expedient to found his doctrine of the Real Presence on a few Sacramental phrases, such as 'in' the Bread, 'in' the type, &c., culled out of the Fathers, and the little word 'in' duly italicised. The manner in which the Fathers generally speak of the Consecrated Elements as Types, Symbols, Sacraments, Antitypes, Signs, &c., considered to be alike fatal to the modern Roman Theory of the Real Presence in the Consecrated Elements, and to the Theory of Dr Pusey, with an Exposure of the Assumption that such Symbolical Words as those above might really be, or contain the things which they Signify or Represent. The phrase, 'under the form of Bread and 'Wine,' in its earliest use shown no more to Teach or to imply a Real Presence in the Consecrated Elements than such phrases as, 'in the 'Type of Bread,' 'under the Veil, Image, or Covering of Bread,' &c., of which it is the equivalent. The word 'Form' in the above sentence, as used by Roman Catholics to denote Unsubstantiality, or a mere Appearance without Reality, shown to be contrary to all Antiquity. The assumption of Dr Pusey and Sir Robert Phillimore that because Bertram used such phrases in relation to the Sacramental Elements, as 'under the Form,' 'under the Veil,' 'under 'the Covering,' &c., he must have believed the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood to be in those Elements, Examined and Refuted. It is also shown that if, as is admitted, the English leading Reformers were Disciples of Bertram, they could not have held, as Sir Robert Phillimore maintained they do, the Doctrine of the Real Presence in the Consecrated Elements, inasmuch as it is proved that Bertram did not hold that Doctrine, but very ably Refuted it. Dr Pusey's conception of the Symbolical Action of the Eucharist shown to be contrary to the Holy Scriptures and the general teaching of the Fathers.	347-396
---	---------

CHAPTER XI.

The Sacramental phrases of Christ not to be taken literally after the manner of those texts which assert his human nature as Dr Pusey contends. Contrary to the theory of Dr Pusey, the Fathers teach that the Sacramental signs of the Eucharist were no more the realities of which they were the signs than were any of the Sacramental signs of the Jewish Church. The teaching of the Fathers illustrated in regard to Christ's being present with the Old Testa-

ment saints through the medium of the Word of God. Their common use of the phrase, 'the Word of God,' as being alike a title of Christ and of the Holy Scriptures, and their belief of Christ's Spiritual Presence in His Word as much as in His Sacraments. Proofs given that the Fathers received the Word of God with as much reverence as they did the Sacramental body and blood of Christ. The Fathers shown to teach that the body and blood of Christ can be received apart from the Sacrament of the Eucharist as well as in it. The metaphorical use of the words bread, and cup or wine, as used by the Fathers in relation to Christ as our Food, shown to be as capable of being received apart from the Sacrament as in it. The word Bread understood by the Fathers to be prophetically applied to Christ as a title. They speak alike of Christ calling His body Bread as they do of His calling bread His body. The phrase, Daily Bread, as spiritually interpreted by the Fathers in relation to Christ personally, shown, according to their teaching, not to be the Sacramental Bread, but rather the reality of which that bread is the sign and as capable of being received with the Word of Christ as with His Sacrament. Augustine, especially, is shown to teach that the Sacramental signs of the Eucharist are no more the flesh and blood of Christ, or contain them, than the signs, whether written or spoken, which convey to us the Word of God, are, or contain His body and blood. Proofs given that the Fathers, and especially Augustine, speak more explicitly of the presence of the body of true believers in the Eucharist than they do of Christ, and that they teach that Christ cannot be present in the Sacrament without His people, and His people cannot be present therein without Him. Evidence given that the Fathers commonly associate the words body and blood in relation to Christ with undoubted metaphorical words which no one pretends can be understood literally. The manner in which the Fathers represent the eating of the Christian Passover shown to be fatal to the idea of a literal participation of Christ's body and blood in that ordinance. 397-460

CHAPTER XII.

The Interpretation of the words of Institution by Roman Catholics considered and proved to be alike contrary to Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers. The true interpretation vindicated from the same sources of proof. The doctrine of Transubstantiation as held by the Greek Church and accepted by Dr Pusey, shown to be the same as the Roman. The folly of Dr Pusey's belief that Millenarian Fathers held that the miraculous abundance of wine in their supposed Millenium was for the Sacrament of the Eucharist exhibited. Full examples given from the Fathers of the manner in which they speak of the Consecrated Elements as being called, named, entitled, figuratively termed, understood to be, or made the image of the body and blood of Christ; or, as figuratively representing, showing, making to appear, or becoming, &c., &c., Christ's Body and Blood.

and their belief of the Paschasian doctrine of the Real Presence proved to be inadmissible with such a manner of speaking. The Fathers and others vindicated from the charge of employing a sophism when they use the phrase, 'I am the True Vine,' in illustration of the words of Institution. Full evidence given from the Fathers as to what constituted the Consecration of the Sacramental Elements, the act shown not to consist in merely pronouncing the words of Institution, and that Christ is not the Consecrator otherwise than that the act has His sanction and authority. The testimony of the most ancient rituals examined and proved to be against the Paschasian doctrine of the Real Presence. The act of Consecration shown to be common to all the Communicants, and the Bishop or Presbyter to have no more inherent right or power of Consecration than any of his fellow Communicants. The Fathers, where they more distinctly explain to the Communicants the nature and effects of Consecration, specially examined and shown to be against the modern doctrine of the Real Presence, as also their exposition and application of the 'sursum corda.' The manner in which some of the Fathers have explained the phraseology of the Eucharist in answer to the Apollinarian and Eutichian heretics shown to be fatal to the doctrine of the Real Presence, and especially to the Transubstantiation form of it. A full examination of the Fathers in relation to Sacrificing, and especially in connection with the Lord's Supper, and the modern doctrine of their being a material sacrifice therein, and an exclusive clerical sacrificing Priesthood connected therewith, shown to be repugnant to Holy Scripture and the most certain teaching of the Fathers.	461-573
--	---------

CHAPTER XIII.

An Examination of those passages from the Fathers which Dr Pusey has more especially cited in proof of his doctrine. Apostolic and other Fathers, whom Dr Pusey has not cited, adduced against him. Some of the leading points of Dr Pusey's recent sermon considered, and references made to other parts of this volume where they have been answered. A full examination of Dr Pusey's Canon of Patristic Interpretation, by which he would make it appear that the Sacramental phrases of the Fathers must be so understood as to teach his doctrine.	574-627
--	---------

CHAPTER XIV.

The result of Dr Pusey's Observance of a Canon of Interpretation of Scripture by the Fathers, compared and contrasted with the result to which Jewel came, by observing the same Canon of which he was the chief framer. The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Church of England proved to be substantially the same as that of other Reformed Churches and Evangelical Communion, and there-

fore more fitted to be in visible communion with them than with the Greek Church. Bishop Browne's Misconceptions respecting the Eucharistic Doctrine of Zwingle pointed out, and a correct statement of his doctrine given, which is shown to be in nowise different from that of the other Reformers, except Luther. Bishop Browne's inaccurate statement respecting the Eucharistic Teaching of the Fathers Exhibited, and his wrong conclusion therefrom corrected. Zwingle's Eucharistic Teaching proved to be the same as that of Calvin, Crammer, and Jewel, as their respective writings testify, and Bishop Browne shown to have failed in his attempts to prove it otherwise. The Sacramental Doctrine of Canon Liddon, as adduced by Sir Robert Phillimore in the Bennett Case, considered and refuted, with a full exposure and refutation of the false charges against the Eucharistic Doctrine of Zwingle. Bishop Browne's groundless complaint against Zwingle respecting the spiritual body of Christ considered, and Zwingle's views respecting it shown to be in accordance with the Doctrine of the Early Church. Also his opinion respecting the Presence of Christ's Glorified Body in the Eucharist shown to be uncatholic and contrary to Scripture. Canon Liddon's Attitude at the Lord's Table viewed in the light of antiquity, and shown to be superstitious and irreverent. The Eucharistic Teaching of Bishop Moberly as cited by Sir Robert Phillimore in the Bennett Case examined and shown to be self-contradictory and alien to the doctrine of his own Church and that of the Ancient Church, especially in making the validity of the Eucharist to depend upon a particular order of men who exist only in the imagination of a few High Anglicans.

AN ANSWER TO DR PUSEY'S CHALLENGE

RESPECTING THE
DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE, &c.

CHAPTER I.—INTRODUCTORY.

ACCOUNT OF THE RITUALISTS AND THEIR CONFIDENCE IN THE TEACHING OF DR PUSEY. THE CHALLENGE FORMALLY STATED. THE CANON OF INTERPRETATION AS HELD BY HIGH ANGLICANS AND THEIR GROSS VIOLATION OF IT. THE FATHERS IN APPEARANCE ONLY FAVOUR THE ROMANISTS, BUT NOT IN REALITY. EXPLANATION OF THE CATENA PATRUM. DR PUSEY'S UNSATISFACTORY TREATMENT OF PATRISTIC TESTIMONY, AND A STATEMENT OF THE MANNER IN WHICH IT SHOULD BE TREATED. THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY UNKNOWN UNTIL THE NINTH CENTURY. THE GENERAL AGREEMENT OF THE FATHERS ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST. THEIR DIFFERENCE OF OPINION IN REGARD TO ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATIONS. THEIR IMPERFECT BIBLICAL KNOWLEDGE. THEIR LOOSE MANNER OF DEFENDING THEIR DOCTRINES BEFORE UNBELIEVERS. THEIR REAL VIEWS OF DOCTRINE BETTER OBTAINED FROM THEIR SOBER, THAN THEIR RHETORICAL STATEMENTS. THE PROPER MODE OF TREATING THEIR TESTIMONY. THEIR COMPETENCY TO GIVE IT.

1. THE question of High Church or Low Church has become absorbed in the more important question, whether the Anglican Church of the last three centuries should or should not entirely change its character, and again become Roman, as before the Reformation. The Ritualists have spoken out. They have ignored the Reformation, and those who shed their blood in its defence they have branded as false witnesses and deceivers. Their number is increasing, and through the press and other means, they are making their influence to be felt

through the realm. They have shown us what they can do, and they openly tell us what they intend to do. But they cannot take us to Rome by force, they must first get a majority of us into the humour to go. There is no immediate ground for alarm, provided we make a decided resolution not only not to go to that renowned, but most dangerous, city,—but to be determined, as those who believe they have God's truth, to rescue as many of our fellow-Christians as possible, to use the sentiment of Jerome, from the Babylon of the Apocalypse, and from the embrace of the Scarlet Lady of the same Revelation. But if, after all, we cannot persuade them to bring back their hearts, then, by all means, through the exercise of a wholesome discipline, let them have the opportunity of taking their bodies whither their hearts have already gone. It certainly has come to this; if our Church is to retain all her substantial features; our motto must be, 'No peace with Rome,' or Romanizers.

2. The confidence which Ritualists and Romanizers have in their newly adopted views, is truly marvellous, and the sincerity of many of them, if not of most, is undoubted. It is a matter of great importance to know whence this assurance is derived, and on what it is founded. With them, it is a matter of little moment what may be the understood teaching of the Reformed Church of England, and of Protestant Churches generally; or what may appear to the members of these churches to be the direct and independent teaching of Holy Scripture. They ask, What did the early Church teach? What do the early Fathers now teach in their writings? And they assume with confidence, that according to the consent of all antiquity, their doctrine of the Real Presence was universally held. But, do these men generally, or any considerable number of them, come to this conclusion from a personal examination of the writings of the Fathers, or do they take for granted that such is their teaching on the testimony of others? The latter may be presumed to be their general practice; and Dr Pusey, of all others, is their great authority. If his 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers have been made by him in the manner he declares they have been made, and the testimony contained therein is such as he affirms it to be, his

disciples have some foundation for their faith. He says, 'The following evidence that the belief in the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first, is more than enough to convince one who is willing to be convinced. If this convince not, neither would any other. There is no flaw, no doubt, I might almost say, no loophole, except that man always finds one to escape what he is unwilling to accept.' (35 39.) If they believe this, and it has all the sanction which Dr Pusey's great reputation for learning and sanctity can give it, they may well be strong in their belief, especially when it is considered that the canon of interpretation by which they come to their conclusions, is admitted and laid down, not only by Roman Catholics and leading Romanizers in the Church of England, but by High Churchmen generally, and by Dr Wordsworth, the present Bishop of Lincoln in particular. Supposing, then, for the present, that the authority on which they rest so much, is all they take it to be; with their accepted canon of interpretation, how can they be otherwise than confident?

3. Two instances of the marvellous assurance these men have in their doctrine of the Real Presence shall now be given. Both shall be chosen from Dr Pusey's oldest disciples. The first is Archdeacon Denison, whom Dr Pusey, some years ago so laboriously defended, that he thereby greatly injured his health. (35 42.) The Archdeacon in his published 'Defence' of himself in relation to his late trial, under the heading, 'Witnesses of Antiquity,' pp. 125-157, has simply adduced those witnesses, and those only, which had been selected, annotated, and duly prepared for the occasion by Dr Pusey.

4. The next case to be adduced is that of the Rev. W. E. Bennett, less lively than the archdeacon, but equally zealous for these strange doctrines. Dr Pusey styles him a 'veteran' and a 'valuable writer.' Of himself he says, 'I have advanced in years and the work of the Church (say from the year 1830). I have gradually learned from yourself [Dr Pusey], and from other Doctors of the Church, to whom in your writings you have referred, the essential necessity of these great truths' (37 4). In the same letter, Mr Bennett

describes Dr Pusey as 'one to whom the whole Church would 'implicitly bow and all reverence.' Mr Bennett's own statements testify to the profound and infatuating influence which the teaching and writings of Dr Pusey had produced on his mind (37 3-8). He assumes that his dear friend and teacher some time since gained the victory, and that from that time 'the 'Church has dwelt confidently in the strength of her faith '[that of the Real Presence], now no longer gainsaid' (37 8).

5. Again, it is asked, do these men, who of late have waxed so bold in their avowal of their doctrine of the Real Presence, believe, as the valiant Archdeacon affirms, that it is Apostolic, Primitive, and Catholic, from a personal acquaintance with the venerable witnesses of antiquity, or do they content themselves, as the Archdeacon and Mr Bennett do, with Dr Pusey's knowledge of them, and supposed fair dealing with them? In the judgment of charity, the latter is believed to be their general practice and not the former, otherwise their sincerity might well be questioned. It is not necessary to use hard words respecting Dr Pusey's treatment of these witnesses; the facts contained in the following pages are hard enough.

6. Dr Pusey's challenge is all the more important when viewed in connection with the position assigned to him as the leader of a party in the Church of England, which in all simplicity and apparent confidence he accepts. The challenge briefly expressed is: 'Prove, by a competent authority, that 'my doctrine on the Eucharist is contrary to the Church of 'England, and I will resign my office' (35 65).

7. With Dr Pusey and his disciples the phrase, 'doctrine 'held by the Church of England,' is very vague, if not delusive as to its meaning. With them what may generally appear to be the teaching of the Church since the Reformation, and especially during the latter half of the sixteenth century, is esteemed as of little importance. In their estimation very essential changes took place after the Restoration in the year 1661. Dean Hook himself says, 'It was not till 'the epoch of the Restoration that the principles of Anglicanism were fully recognised by Convocation, and accepted 'by Parliament.'—(*Discourses on Controversies of the Day*, p. 32.)

8. Archdeacon Denison, in his defence before his accusers, assumed that the doctrine of the Church of England rested on the doctrine of the Church Primitive. This will at once be seen by an extract from his *Defence*, published by himself, p. 121 :—‘ Proposition to be proved, *negatively*, The doctrines ‘or positions of the accused may not lawfully be ruled to be ‘contrary, or repugnant, to the doctrine of the Church of ‘England; for it cannot be shown that these doctrines or ‘positions are contrary, or repugnant to, the doctrine of the ‘Church Primitive.’

9. *Affirmatively*. The doctrines or positions of the ‘accused are TRUE doctrines or positions; for they are *the* ‘*same* doctrines or positions *with those* which have been ‘collected out of the Old and New Testament by the ‘“Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops,” and which are ‘embodied in the ancient Liturgies.’

10. For the doctrine of the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops we are referred in the margin to Dr Pusey’s elaborate volume of 730 pages, which we learn elsewhere was especially prepared for the defence of the Archdeacon, and from which he quotes as ‘witnesses of antiquity,’ upwards of thirty royal octavo pages in small type. With Dr Pusey it is a settled point that the doctrine of the Church of England must be determined by that of the early Church. If he did not pen the above proposition for the defence of the Archdeacon, it may at least be understood as expressing his view of the case. His challenge, then, in justice to himself, may well be put in the form of that proposition both negatively and affirmatively. As if he had said—

11. *Negatively*. My doctrines on the Holy Eucharist cannot be proved to be contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England; for it cannot be shown that they are contrary to the doctrine of the Church Primitive.

12. *Affirmatively*. My doctrines on the Holy Eucharist are true; for they are the same as those which have been collected by me out of the writings of the early Fathers, as published in my book, entitled, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, from the death of St John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council.*

13. In this volume, the exact converse of that proposition is maintained. Formally stated it is as follows :—*Affirmatively*, Dr Pusey's doctrines on the Holy Eucharist can be proved to be contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England ; for it can be shown that they are contrary to the doctrine of the Church Primitive.

14. *Negatively*, Dr Pusey's doctrines on the Holy Eucharist are not true ; for they are not the same as those which have been collected by him out of the writings of the early Fathers as published in his book, entitled 'The Doctrine of the Real ' Presence,' &c. And much less are his doctrines the same as those which he has omitted to collect out of the said Fathers from the death of St John the Evangelist to the first general council, which omission, in part, is supplied in some of the following pages.

15. Dr Pusey in his formal challenge speaks of his doctrine being 'decided by a competent authority.' Beyond all question, with him the early Fathers are considered a competent authority, and he believes that the Church of England recognises that authority as the ground of appeal for the truth of her doctrines. It is not at all necessary that we should bind ourselves by these admissions. It is sufficient for our purpose that Dr Pusey and his school appeal to the early Fathers as judges on the points in dispute, and that in so doing, they believe that they are acting in accordance with the will of their Church. We accept the discussion on their own grounds. If these, their own judges, are shown to be against them, their case is lost.

16. High Anglicans as well as Romanists in general, adopt a particular canon in the interpretation of Scripture, and as we have to follow it, our readers ought to know what it is. As briefly stated by Dr Wilberforce, the Bishop of Winchester, it is as follows :—' On us, in our day, as having inherited the ' pure deposit ; on us, as witnesses and guardians of the ancient ' faith ; on us, as solemnly set to interpret God's Word, as ' from old it has been interpreted.' (*Sermon preached at St Mary's Church, Oxford.* 1855, p. 24.)

17. The canon for the most part implies two assumptions :
1st. That there is a particular class of men who are supposed

to have ‘the same apostolic, episcopal, and pastoral office of ‘the Twelve,’ and, 2^{ndly}. That these men are divinely authorised to interpret the Scriptures, and teach Christian doctrine after the manner of their predecessors. Hence, Dr Wordsworth, the Bishop of Lincoln states, ‘If there is such a thing ‘as the Church Universal, to which Christ has promised His ‘presence and His Spirit ; if there are such words as the following in the New Testament, “Lo, I am with you alway, “even unto the end of the world.” “The Comforter shall “teach you all things, and guide you into all truth,”’ &c. Dr Wordsworth intends these phrases to be understood as strong affirmations. He afterwards remarks, ‘It is an illusory ‘hope, that advances can be made in the work of sacred interpretation, by the instrumentality of any who reject the expositions of Scripture received by the consent of ancient Christendom, and who propound new interpretations invented by ‘themselves, at variance with the general teaching of Scripture as received by the Catholic Church.’ (*Notes on the Greek Testament Preface*, p. ix.)

18. Dr Wiseman also lays enormous stress on the words, ‘Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.’ He represents the Lord Jesus as conveying in those words to His apostles and their successors His own supreme authority, which authority he describes as a species of infallibility. This idea is expanded and attempted to be confirmed by kindred texts, and finally he comes to the conclusion that our Lord through the medium of those words established a class of teachers in lieu of prophecy, and that the successors of the apostles in the Church of Christ have received the security of His own words and His promise of a perpetual teaching, so that they should not be allowed to fall into error.—(‘*Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*, Lecture IV. *The Catholic Rule of Faith proved.*’ Pp. 101-104.)

19. Strange to say these three doctors solemnly interpret this text *not* as from old it has been interpreted, but as from a very recent date. They reject its ancient meaning as unanimously expounded and received by the consent of ancient Christendom, and they propound a new one in its place in-

vented by somebody directly at variance with the general teaching of Scripture, as received by the Catholic Church. This point has already been considered and is thought to be settled in the first chapter of the book entitled, 'Whose are the Fathers?' so that only the briefest examination of it can be given here. The use and application made of the words, 'Lo I am with you alway, &c.,' by Dean Hook, the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, Rev. Hugh James Rose, Dr Phillpots, the Hon. W. E. Gladstone, and the Rev. W. Palmer, are fully given in the above-named volume. Not one of these writers attempts to justify the use and application of the text from ancient expositions of it, although it is very frequently commented upon by the Fathers. The consensus of all antiquity is given, from which it is seen that the text in question is never applied particularly to such as Pope, Bishop, or Presbyter, exclusively of believers, saints, or Christians in general, but is applied indiscriminately to all. Full extracts are given from Origen, Cyprian, Novatian, Athanasius, Hilary the bishop, Macarius, Jerome, Ruffinus, Augustine, Gaudentius, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo I., Theodoret, and Fulgentius. These are authors of the first six centuries to whom in my book the appeal is chiefly made. But it is also shewn that in later times in the commentaries of Bede, Aquinas, Theophylact, and Nicolas De Lyra, the same exposition was retained. Many of the Fathers, it is shown, considered the words in question to have been addressed by our Lord not merely to the eleven apostles, but to a multitude of disciples.

20. A few passages in the Catena appended to the present volume contain incidentally the text and an application of it. Origen, with others, it will be seen, applied to all saints generally the text which Dr Wiseman confines to a certain order of men. (11 42, 45). Augustine applied the text to his congregation generally. (21 97, 102). Bede, an author of the seventh century, also applies the same text to saints and the members of the Church generally. (24 2, 3, 21). So does Rabanus Maurus, a commentator of the ninth century. (26 11.) Paschasius, whose name is the first that stands connected with the maintenance and defence of the doctrine

of the Real Presence, as held by Dr Pusey and his school, well expresses what is the interpretation of all antiquity on the text under consideration when he speaks of it as giving ‘great confidence to all who believe in Christ, for He did not ‘promise this to His disciples only, but also to all Christians.’ (33 30.)

21. It turns out, then, that the extraordinary authority which these bishops and doctors assume that our Lord gave to His apostles, and those who are supposed to inherit their mantle, when He uttered those consoling words, ‘Lo, I am with you,’ &c., can only be established by violating their own canon, in rejecting the exposition of those words received by the consent of ancient Christendom, and propounding a new interpretation, invented probably since the days of the Reformation, and at variance with the general teaching of Scripture as received by the Catholic Church.

22. If, after all, these men should still claim a species of divine authority communicated to an order of rulers which they are pleased to call the Church, we ask, On what are these claims founded? and the only answer which has yet been given consists of a set of assumptions contrary to the facts of the case as recorded in the writings of the early Fathers. The Bishop of Oxford speaks of ‘believing in the ‘Holy Ghost, and therefore *in* the Holy Catholic Church.’ In the avowal of such a faith he is quite off the square with all antiquity, and especially with the earliest and most valuable expositions of the creed. This topic has been already fully considered in the seventh chapter of ‘Whose are the Fathers? &c.’

23. In exposing the errors of the High Anglicans and Romanists, we intend honestly and faithfully to follow their rule of interpretation, but shall regard their glaring and gross violations of it as very bad examples to be avoided.

24. Our readers are besought not to be too suspicious of an appeal to these traditionary teachings of the Fathers on the points in dispute. The most learned and able divines of the sixteenth century appealed to them confidently and successfully, especially on the doctrine in question. To conclude, as some Churchmen do, that the Fathers are substantially on the

side of these innovators in the Church of England, is a concession as dangerous as it is unfounded. And these men, many of whom appear to be ignorant and unscrupulous, turn the concession immensely to their own advantage. It must be admitted that they have an apparent advantage from the phraseology and ceremonial of the Fathers, and it is no part of the object of this book to deprive them of it in the one case or the other, but rather to prove that they give a wrong and perverted meaning to the former, and it may be noticed in passing that the latter is used for other purposes than the Fathers intended, or even knew of. The chief argument for the use of the vestments is in the honour paid thereby to the supposed Real Presence in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, whereas the vestments were in use long before the objective presence doctrine was invented. Rabanus Maurus gives a full account of them in his instruction to the clergy, occupying no less than eight chapters. (*Lib. i. cap. 14-21, tom. vi. pp. 7, 8.*) But his writings, as will be seen in these pages, furnish one of our best testimonies against the modern doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements.

25. The learned Archbishop Usher, when alluding to the phraseology and ceremonial of the Fathers, has well said,

'Now, true it is, if a man do only attend unto the bare sound of the word, or to the thing in general, without descending into particular consideration of the true ground thereof, he may easily be induced to believe, that in divers of these controversies the Fathers speak clearly for them [Roman Catholics] and against us: neither is there any one thing that hath won more credit to that religion, or more advanced it in the consciences of simple men, than the conformity that it retaineth in some words and outward observances with the ancient Church of Christ. Whereas if the thing itself were narrowly looked into, it would be found that *they* have only the shell without the kernel, and *we* the kernel without the shell: they have retained certain words and rites of the ancient Church, but applied them to an invented doctrine; and we on the other side having relinquished these words and observances, but retaining nevertheless the same primitive doctrine, unto which by their institution they had relation.'

—*Answer to a Challenge, &c. The Epistle Dedicatory.*

26. As Dr Pusey's writings on the Eucharist are confessedly fragmentary and incomplete, it was necessary, in order that

the whole system might be brought under review, to supply the deficiency from some of his brethren and pupils who have stated and defended parts of the doctrine which he had omitted. It should be borne in mind that hitherto Dr Pusey's health has not permitted him to complete the vindication of his belief in regard to these doctrines (35 42, 46). Dean Goode very successfully answered Archdeacon Denison on these points, at the same time that Dr Pusey was straining his health in defending him. In a second book, published by Dr Pusey in defence of the Archdeacon, he takes notice of Dean Goode's work on the Eucharist, and, after a few brief remarks, says, 'These I hope to consider when it shall please God to give me 'health' (35 46). His health and strength appear not yet to have been equal to the task, as he has not since accomplished it.

27. One great drawback to works of controversy often is, that the sentiments of opponents are not stated with sufficient fulness, parts being often quoted without a sufficiency of the context to enable the reader to obtain the full meaning. To avoid this evil, the reasons and arguments of the maintainers and defenders of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and other questionable doctrines on the Eucharist, examined and considered in this volume, are given under the names of their respective authors, which forms the last part of the *Catena Patrum*, under the heading 'False Witnesses to the True 'Doctrine,' and, for convenience, references are made thereto rather than to the original volumes whence those doctrines have been obtained.

28. This is the place in which to explain the nature and object of our *Catena*. It consists of thirty-eight witnesses; thirty-one true and seven false witnesses to the orthodox doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The true witnesses may be divided into three classes: 1st, Authors who come between the dates which Dr Pusey assigned to himself within which to cite authorities. These are Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Barnabas, Epistle to Diognetus, Justin, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, Gaudentius, Ruffinus, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. Seven of these—

namely, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Polycarp, Barnabas, Epistle to Diognetus, Lactantius, and Ruffinus, form no part of Dr Pusey's *Catena Patrum*.

29. 2d class. To Dr Pusey's list we have added four witnesses of a much later date—viz., Bede, who lived but a short time before the doctrine of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements was invented; Bertram and Rabanus Maurus at the time of its introduction by Paschasius, and both opposed it, but especially the former; and Elfrie, one of our English archbishops, who lived about 150 years after Paschasius, and took sides with Bertram.

30. 3d class. This consists of four Reformers—two foreign, Zwingle and Calvin, and two English, Cranmer and Jewel. These have been adduced as representatives of the doctrines of the Lord's Supper, as commonly held by the Reformers, and especially by those of the Church of England. These it is maintained (Zwingle not excepted) better represent the teaching of the Fathers in relation to the Eucharist than either High Anglicans, Ritualists, or Romanists, and are brought forward for that purpose.

31. The last seven authors are adduced as false witnesses in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. These are Paschasius, Dr Wiseman, Dr Pusey, Archdeacon Denison, Rev. W. E. Bennett, Dr Hamilton, the late Bishop of Salisbury, and the Rev. Orby Shipley. The judgment delivered by the 'Right Hon. Sir Robert Phillimore, D.C.L., in the case of the office of Judge 'promoted by Sheppard v. Bennett,' though not included among these witnesses to which it naturally belongs, yet will be fully considered and answered so far as it comes within the scope and object of this book. As Paschasius was the chief author and inventor of the wide spread heresy in regard to the Lord's Supper, full extracts have been adduced from his writings, so that the reader may see and know for himself what the heresy was in its earliest development. What Paschasius was in the middle of the ninth century to the Latin Church Dr Pusey is in the middle of the nineteenth century to the English Church. On comparing the teaching of these two heresiarchs it will be seen that the Puseyism of the nineteenth century is nearly the same as the Paschasianism of the ninth century.

32. We have selected sixteen of Dr Pusey's principal witnesses, and have largely supplemented their testimony by important extracts from their writings omitted by Dr Pusey. To have quoted the whole of his witnesses, and treated them after the same manner, would have required a goodly folio volume. It is believed that the present list of authors is more than sufficient to decide the controversy. Nay, we maintain that three of the most competent would have been amply sufficient. Say one of the third, one of the fourth, and one of the fifth centuries, and each the best reputed commentator and Biblical scholar of the century in which he lived. Beyond all doubt these three are Origen, Jerome, and Theodoret, and all that Dr Pusey has thought suitable for his purpose to quote from these three authors is included in our Catena.

33. In Dr. Pusey's 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers, we find the common sacramental language of Holy Scripture, in which the sign takes the name of the thing signified. But repeating the same figure of speech, or form of expression many thousands of times adds nothing to the argument. The question is, What is the meaning of the figure of speech or form of expression? He affixes his own meaning to the sacramental language of the Fathers, and assumes that they teach his doctrine. Nearly the whole of Dr. Pusey's evidence from the Fathers consists of sacramental phrases, in which the signs take the names of the things which they signify. Of these perhaps there are some thousands, and every leaf containing them is conspicuously headed, 'Testimony to the belief in the 'real presence in the early Church.' But one assumption once made, is intrinsically of as much value as if it were 5000 times repeated. Why then has Dr. Pusey indulged in this kind of repetition? Probably a reason might be given from the practice of some modern advertisers who, though a line expresses all that they wish to be made public, yet repeat this line by the column.

34. Dr. Pusey, at the end of his Catena, affirms, 'I have 'suppressed nothing; I have not knowingly omitted anything: 'I have given every passage, as far as in me lay, with as much 'of the context as was necessary for the clear exhibition of its 'meaning.' (35 41.)

35. That the reader may see how rash and inconsiderate Dr. Pusey must have been in making this affirmation, what has been quoted from his witnesses will be printed in distinct brackets, and from the parts supplied which he had omitted, his garbled extracts, unfair translations, and unaccountable omissions will at once be made manifest.

36. As Dr. Pusey, in his fuller citations from the Fathers, has given much that is irrelevant, and as it is impossible to know on what parts he would lay the most stress in this larger work, which he entitles 'Notes on a Sermon, the Presence of 'Christ in the Holy Eucharist,' we fall back upon the sermon itself, where happily he has given in a condensed form what may be considered in his judgment the most suitable parts of his 400 pages to prove his doctrine. All that he has there quoted from those sixteen of his principal witnesses, which we have more especially undertaken to examine, we have given in full, and it may be found under No. 28 in the Catena.

37. The marginal references in the Catena, are to those parts of the volume where the passages are considered, from which the references have been made.

38. Before making an appeal to the Fathers on the subject of this volume, it will be necessary to ascertain whether they are capable of giving testimony on the question in hand. Certainly not any of them could be capable for the first eight centuries, and for this very plain reason, that the subject of this controversy had not then begun to exist. Had this controversy commenced, as did that of heretical baptism, in the third century, with Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, and Stephen, Bishop of Rome, instead of with Paschasius and Bertram in the ninth century, the case would have been entirely different. We then should have to form the best judgment we could of the *ex parte* statements of partizans. Happily for us such is not the case. We want to know at present what was the free unbiassed interpretation of the Fathers of certain texts of holy Scripture, now in so much use in the present controversy; and their testimony, although indirect, is yet the more valuable. But then we are told by some of our friends that 'Father contradicts Father, and that each Father contradicts 'himself.' If so, it must be admitted that evidence of this

nature would be rejected as worthless in any civil court, and certainly ought not to be received in the court of conscience, either for or against any point in dispute; but we do not believe that this charge against the Fathers has any substantial truth in it, and with respect to their doctrines on the Lord's Supper, we confidently deny it, and refer to the Catena for proof of their substantial agreement on this subject.

39. We can vouch for Dr Pusey's having brought together all that he considered best calculated to support his side of the question, and he has also availed himself of the result of the recent researches of two learned Roman Catholic Cardinals. (35 38). What Dr Pusey and these Roman Cardinals have found convenient to omit has in our Catena been supplied, and we feel assured that nothing of importance can be added on either side of the question, on the supposition that the question has two sides. Here, then, if any where we should expect to meet with contradictions; but they are not to be found. Let the candid reader examine the various utterances of the Fathers, whether of the Greek or Latin Church, whether of the second or the seventh, or any intermediate century, with a simple desire to understand them, and we venture to think that he will find no contradictions. The reader must note well that the passages omitted by Dr Pusey which in the following Catena are supplied, are in no sense contradictory statements, but rather serve as a true key to the meaning of the sacramental language of the Fathers.

40. The reader not before acquainted with them will be struck with their mystical or allegorical mode of interpretation as compared with that of the generality of modern commentators among Protestants. Bishop Wordsworth, in his commentary, condemns the latter, and commends the former. What he has stated on this subject will be found in the Introductions to his commentaries on the Old Testament. (vol. i., pp. xix. xx., vol. iii. p. xxv.)

41. But this use of allegorising and imagination in the interpretation of Scripture is an open question with the Fathers in no way binding upon themselves or upon us. The Bishop has given one side of the question, let us hear the other, Basil says—

‘I know the laws of allegory, and if not, you may know from me

‘that I light upon worn out allegories from others. . . . When I hear ‘of grass, I understand it to mean grass, and so of plants, and fishes, ‘and beasts, and cattle: all of them, as they are spoken, so I receive. ‘For neither am I ashamed of the Gospel. . . . In the oracles of the ‘Spirit I desire to glorify Him, who has not employed our understand- ‘ing on vain things, but has dispensed all so as to be written for our ‘edification, and the perfecting of our souls. Of which truth, as I ‘think, some not being aware, have tried, by I know not what allure- ‘ments and figures of speech to get the Scriptures credit for a kind of ‘dignity, which, in fact is of their own devising. But this is to make ‘one’s self wiser than the oracles of the Spirit, and under the show of ‘interpretation covertly to introduce matter of our own.’ (*In Hexæ- meron, Hom. ix., tom. i., pp. 69 97.*)

Jerome, the most learned and most valuable witness of all the Fathers on objects of this nature, says of Origen that ‘He roams ‘in the free plains of allegory, and in the interpreting of names ‘of single things, makes his own fancies the sacraments of the ‘Church.’ (*In Esaiam, lib. v. prolog. tom. v., p. 52*). He confesses in his preface to his commentary on Obadiah that in his early efforts at exposition he indulged very much in allegorical interpretations, which others applauded, but of which he was ashamed as he grew older.

42. Theodoret, the best commentator of the fifth, if not of all previous centuries, describes some as ‘running into alle- ‘gory, with great insatiableness,’ (*Præf. in Psalm, tom. i., p. 603*), and has made but little use of it in his commentaries.

43. *The question, however, is not whether the Fathers were correct in their interpretations of Scripture, or in their principles of interpretation, but whether they really did so interpret them as to admit of Dr. Pusey’s doctrine and that of his school on the Eucharist; for this is all that we are at present concerned to know.*

44. It is due to these venerable men that their writings be judged from their own point of view, and not from ours. Biblical interpretation was but little known in their day. Many of them could read no portion of the original Scriptures. Greek Fathers of course could read the Greek Testament, and the old Testament by means of an imperfect Greek Translation. Many Latin Fathers were in a worse position, having access to the old Testament only through a corrupt and defective Latin version of the Greek Septuagint just named. Some of the extraordinary statements of these ancient men in relation to

the Lord's Supper are founded upon absurd renderings in the Italic version just alluded to. Others through their defective conceptions of true morality in their religious intercourse with their fellowmen practised deceit when they considered it might be for their good. Clement of Alexandria gives the following rule, 'Whatever, therefore, he (the teacher) has in 'his mind, he bears on his tongue, to those who are worthy 'to hear, speaking as well as living from assent and inclination. 'For he both thinks and speaks the truth; unless at any time, 'medicinally, as a physician for the safety of the sick, he may 'lie or tell an untruth, according to the Sophists. For 'instance, the noble Apostle circumcised Timothy, though 'loudly declaring and writing that circumcision made with 'hands profits nothing.'—(*Strom.* lib. vii. p. 730.)

44. Other Fathers acted on this principle, and like Clement misconceived that they had such precedents set before them by Patriarchs and Apostles and that they were sanctioned by the approval of God. Chrysostom vindicates this practice in his treatise on the Christian priesthood. Men with such mistaken views would think they were acting in accordance with Divine examples in overrating the nature of the ministerial office and the rites of the Lord's Supper, if they supposed that they could benefit their fellowmen by doing so.

45. It is universally admitted that during the first eight centuries there was no controversy in relation to the Lord's Supper, and when we find Fathers zealously defending the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, against those who in any way called it in question, and the Greek Fathers requiring assent and consent to certain shades of opinion respecting the Divine Nature of Christ so minute that perhaps the refined Greek language alone could express them, they assuredly would not understate any thing relating to the rites and doctrines of the Lord's Supper, nor allow any one else to do so without rebuke. There might be in their opinion reasons for commending, in their highest style of rhetoric, the benefits of the Lord's supper to their audiences, and especially to those who were coming to the holy table for the first time, but there could be no reasons why these men should apparently disparage that holy ordinance by laying aside their figures of rhetoric, and speaking of it in plain and sober language. That they do so

speak of it the following pages abundantly testify, and as they were not considered to be irreverend nor charged with heresy for so doing, we shall be justified in taking their sober and more moderate statements, rather than their adorned and rhetorical ones; in fact, their true sentiments respecting the rites of the Lord's Supper, are rather to be obtained in their weakest, than in their strongest statements respecting it.

46. We should also have some fixed principles of quotation from these ancient men, so as to leave in harmony their general statements of the doctrine in question; but to quote from a Father just half a dozen sentences from as many folio volumes, not easily explained, and to make them the standard by which to judge of the real teaching of the author, would be most unfair and unjust; it would, in fact, be making a fool of the author and folly of his writings.

47. If these men were absolutely ignorant of the doctrines of the Eucharist attributed to them, a formal denial or refutation of them could not be expected. But if they held the doctrines as Dr Pusey alleges, we ought to find the most clear and distinct affirmation of the same, especially as he maintains that they were held 'always, everywhere, and by all' (35 58). We find no such affirmation of the doctrines, but on the contrary a vast amount of multifarious statements and arguments, utterly incompatible with it.

48. In an age when so little is known from a personal acquaintance with the writings of the Fathers, it will not be out of place to remark that they were as competent to state their own views and to maintain them on anything relating to their own calling, as clearly, logically, and consistently as any men of the like calling of the present age. Some of them, like Jerome, were men of profound and varied learning; others, like Augustine, though not great in biblical learning, were possessed of keen and cultivated intellects, and had enormous powers of argumentation. It should be borne in mind that much of their writings which has come down to us was not prepared by them for publication, especially sermons and homilies. Many of these were spoken extempore, and some without premeditation, and were often addressed to village congregations. These remarks apply especially to the great and good Augustine.

CHAPTER II.

ONE OF DR PUSEY'S STRANGE ASSERTIONS CONSIDERED. HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY RESPECTING THE EUCHARIST. DR PUSEY CLAIMING AUTHORS TO BE ON HIS SIDE WHEN THEY ARE NOT REALLY SO. THE RIGHT MODE OF INTERPRETING SACRAMENTAL LANGUAGE. LITERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION CONSIDERED. DR PUSEY AT VARIANCE WITH HIMSELF. A KNOWLEDGE OF THE ORIGINAL OF THE OLD TESTAMENT ESSENTIAL TO RIGHT INTERPRETATION OF THE NEW. MISTAKES OF THE FATHERS IN CONSEQUENCE OF NOT KNOWING THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES. AN EXTRAORDINARY INSTANCE OF DR PUSEY'S LITERAL INTERPRETATION CONSIDERED. A LITERAL INTERPRETATION DEFINED. THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST NEITHER REPEATED NOR CONTINUED. AN INSTANCE IN WHICH DR PUSEY VIOLATES HIS OWN RULES, IN NOT INTERPRETING THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION AFTER THE MANNER OF A WILL. HOW ST PAUL CALLS REPEATEDLY THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS BY THE NAMES OF BREAD AND WINE. DR PUSEY AGAIN VIOLATING HIS OWN RULES IN NOT INTERPRETING AS LITERALLY AS HE PRETENDS. THE USE OF THE WORD BODY IN RELATION TO THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST CONSIDERED, AND DR PUSEY'S VIEWS OF THE PRESENCE OF THAT BODY. ASSUMED BY HIM AND MR SHIPLEY THAT CHRIST'S BODY CAN BE PRESENT EVERYWHERE, AND IN THE SMALLEST PORTION OF THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS. DR PUSEY'S UNFOUNDED ASSUMPTION THAT CHRIST CONTRIVED AND INVENTED A MODE OF THE PRESENCE OF HIS BODY NOWHERE REVEALED IN SCRIPTURE, CONSIDERED. DR PUSEY'S MIRACLE THE MOST MARVELLOUS BY WAY OF ACCOUNTING FOR THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS SHEWN TO BE WITHOUT EVIDENCE AND CONTRARY TO FACT. A FULL STATEMENT OF DR PUSEY'S OWN MARVELLOUS LITERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION. INSTANCES IN WHICH BOTH DR PUSEY AND ROMAN CATHOLICS INTERPRET THE SAME WORDS OR PART OF THE SAME WORDS OF INSTITUTION ALSO FIGURATIVELY.

1. WE have now to examine Dr Pusey's doctrines of the Eucharist, and those of Roman Catholics, Ritualists, and High Anglo-Catholics in the light of the Holy Scriptures. The reader in the following pages will often have occasion to marvel at Dr Pusey's assertions and acts of faith. We shall commence with one of his assertions. When he first propounded the doctrine of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements, he affirmed 'Nothing, throughout the whole sermon, was further from my mind than controversy.' (35 1.) Yet his doctrine of the

Presence was so real and Romish, that the organs of the Roman Catholics accepted it as identical with their own. They say, 'The sermon is in truth a string of quotations from 'the Fathers from the beginning to the end to 'prove the reality of Christ's presence.'—*Dublin Review*.

2. Dr Pusey was suspended by the authorities of his University for two years for propounding such a doctrine. Yet in the face of all this he declares, 'Nothing, throughout the 'whole sermon, was further from my thoughts than contro-'versy.' (35 1.) All things considered, it was one of the most controversial acts in the history of the Reformed Church of England. If Dr Pusey means that he avoided stating the arguments of the great doctors of his Church, by which it was generally supposed that they had fully and finally settled the question of the Lord's Supper against the Roman Church, to save himself the task of attempting to answer them, we may accept his statement as true. As this question had been settled as long as three hundred years ago, the lapse of time favoured Dr Pusey's ignoring of it.

3. The history of the controversy is soon stated. For some years after the final separation of the Church of England from Rome, the doctrine of the Real Presence was retained, and those who formally denied it, and were convicted of the same, were treated in the then orthodox fashion, and were roasted alive. The case of the good man John Lambert is one in point. Soon after this, public disputations on the doctrine were held in the University of Oxford and other places, and it was submitted to a rigid scrutiny. The doctrine then, as now, was made to rest on the testimony of the ancient Fathers. Their ponderous tomes were duly explored, and it was found that those early records for the most part retained the 'Church' as at first, when 'built upon the foundation of the apostles 'and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-'stone.' Discovering that in subsequent times vast additions had been made to the spiritual fabric, they set to work and pulled down such parts as they found had not existed in the earlier church. The result may be seen in the difference of the Liturgy of the English Church of 1549, as compared with the ponderous and complicated mass of beliefs, teachings, and

doings of the Church of Rome. Several words of a sacrificial character, in common and innocent use with the early Church, were retained in this Liturgy in the communion service, though not so used in Scripture. But as there were some who would understand these words in the modern Roman sense, they were finally removed from the Liturgy in the year 1552.

4. Perhaps no question was so completely settled by the Doctors of the English Church as that of the real presence. We wish to claim no particular merit for these men. Their position was something like that of the blind man in the Gospel. The facts were in their favour. If we may use a little figure of speech, the doctrine in question had been tried, condemned, executed, and buried, and covered with so great a heap of arguments, that if these had been stones the place of entombment would have been signalled by a species of Egyptian pyramid. The famous Jewel contributed much to this important work; and before the age had passed away in which they laid ghosts, as if to prevent its very ghost from returning, Albertinus published his great work entitled, *De Eucharistia, sive Cœnæ Dominicæ Sacramento*, which left nothing to be added. Dr Pusey declines becoming a resurrectionist to this doctrine, a controversy that would involve the removal of such a pyramid is far from his mind. He assumes the doctrine to be still alive in the English Church and to avoid startling any one by such a discovery he introduces it under the patronage of two bishops whose humble and devoted disciple he professes to be, (35 1.) He begs his doctrine of these bishops, that is, he puts their names down on his list and claims them as his patrons; and the character in which he commences he well sustains throughout, in fact he is a fine example of a mendicant friar. We trust the reader will have patience to accompany us in our tour of investigation of his sayings and doings and more especially in our examination of his list of patrons.

5. It is a point of the first importance to determine the right principle of interpretation in regard to the sacramental language of the Lord's Supper. Is it, and the sacramental language of Holy Scripture in general to be interpreted literally or figuratively? Dr Pusey and his school maintain not that all sacramental language is to be literally interpreted, but that

of the Lord's Supper only. On the other hand we contend, until it is proved to the contrary, that one principle of interpretation should be applied to the whole of the sacramental language of Scripture, and that such language being figurative or elliptical cannot be interpreted literally. Dr Pusey and Roman Catholics generally hold that the propositions employed in the institution of the Lord's Supper must be understood to be simple literal ones, neither being figurative nor elliptical. Dr Wiseman says, 'The Catholic [meaning a modern Roman 'one] believes it to be Christ's body, the Protestant a figure 'of Christ's body.' (34 11.) Dr Pusey states, 'I receive in 'their literal sense our blessed Lord's solemn words. . . . 'The consecrated elements become truly and really His body 'and blood.' (35 1.) Again, 'all things combine to make us 'take our Lord's words solemnly and literally.' (35 13.) Mr Bennet expresses himself very strongly, 'The real, actual, and 'visible Presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches.' (37 1.) The late Bishop of Salisbury said, 'The body and 'blood of Christ become really present, and by this I mean "present *without us*," and not *only* "in the soul of the 'receiver." The body and blood of Christ are present "*objective*," and not "*subjective*" only,' (38 22.) Mr Shipley states, 'The bread and wine are not figures and symbols of a 'person absent, under those external forms there is the *true, real*, 'and *substantial* presence of Christ's body and blood, animated 'by the living soul, and both pervaded by the living DEITY— 'Whole CHRIST, GOD, and MAN.' (39 9.) Again, 'We take 'His words literally.' (39 10.)

6. This mode of interpreting our Lord's words, used as they were, in the rites of an avowed sacramental institution is contrary to the analogy of Holy Scripture. Dr Pusey not only maintains that our Lord's words in the supper must be interpreted literally, but applies to them the most stringent rules of literal interpretation adducing the well-known rule of Hooker. (35 13.) Here we have to charge Dr Pusey with a gross violation of his own rule. He tells us, 'From Bishop 'Andrewes originally, and with him I learned to receive in 'their literal sense our blessed Lord's solemn words, "This is "my body."' (35 1.) Will it be believed that Dr Pusey's

interpretation of the words is exactly opposite to that of Andrewes ! He, as quoted by Bishop Wordsworth on 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, observes—

‘Will ye mark one thing more that *Epulemur* (*let us keep the feast*) doth here refer to *immolatus* (*was sacrificed*) ; to Christ, not every way considered, but as He was *offered*. Christ’s body that now is. True ; but not Christ’s body as now it is, but as *then* it was *when* it *was offered*, rent, and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not as now He is glorified, for so He is not, so He cannot be *immolatus* (*sacrificed*) for He is immortal and impassible ; but as then He was when He suffered death, that is passible and mortal. Then in His passible estate did He institute this of ours, to be a memorial of His *passible* and *Passio* (*Passion*) both. And we are in this action not only carried *up* to Christ (*sursum corda*), but we are also carried *back* to Christ as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering.’

7. The Old Testament is by far the most ancient book, or rather collection of books, of which we have any knowledge, and, as might be expected, we find considerable peculiarity in its language, and unusual figures of speech which must arrest the attention of every intelligent and thoughtful reader. But though the New Testament is of course less ancient, and the Greek language in which it is written essentially different from that of the Hebrew, yet its religious terms used in connection with the pure worship of Jehovah, and its language expressive of sacramental rites are derived almost exclusively, from the Old Testament. Of late, in this nineteenth century, the New Testament has been interpreted mostly from itself, and if any external aid has been sought, it has been either classic or patristic, or both combined. So completely has the Old Testament been disregarded as a guide in the interpretation of the New, that men have considered themselves competent to interpret the latter without any knowledge of the original language of the former. This is much to be deplored, especially, as during the last half century, very great progress has been made in the knowledge of the Hebrew. Men in this latter half of the nineteenth century, with little or no knowledge of the original of the Old Testament, are looked up to with confidence, not only as interpreters of the New Testament, but of the Old also. This would not be long tolerated in a less sacred profession.

8. Some of the best of the Fathers had no knowledge of

the original Scriptures of the Old Testament, and consequently often make many curious mistakes ; one especially occurs in the interpretation of a Greek word ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$) or rather a Hebrew word (פסח) in Greek characters, which they, supposing to be derived from $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega$, explain as meaning passion or suffering, whereas its proper meaning is Passover. According to Jerome, it was thus misunderstood by most Fathers, (18 55.) It is so misinterpreted in the writings of Irenæus, Tertullian, Lactantius, Ambrose, and Chrysostom.

9. We are now prepared to act upon our own theory, as hinted at in the foregoing remarks. It is tenfold more easy to ascertain what saith the Scriptures on the points under dispute, than what say the Fathers, and incalculably more satisfactory. Our advantages at the present day in regard to the study of the Scriptures are incomparably superior to those of the early Fathers, and it may be said with truth, that had the great Augustine lived in our day, and devoted the same time and talents to the study of the Scriptures as he did in his own day, he would have known vastly more of their true and accurate teaching than all the Fathers put together, the Bishop of Hippo not excepted.

10. We are now to examine some of the so-called literal interpretations of our Lord's words of institution. Harding, the papist, in his controversy with Bishop Jewel, assumed from the words of institution that the sacrificial act is still continued, and deduced therefrom that Roman 'priests have authority to 'offer up Christ to God.' (*Works of Jewel*, vol. ii. pp. 713, 714.) Strange as it may appear, Dr Pusey has reproduced the same interpretation, and founded upon it the same argument. He says, 'Those solemn words, wherever recorded, 'speak of the act as a present act, "This is my body which *is* " "given for you." "This is my blood of the New Testament " "which *is* shed for many for the remission of sins." He saith 'not, "which shall be given," "shall be broken," "shall be " "shed ;" but "is being given," "being broken," "being shed," 'and this in remarkable contrast with His own words, when 'speaking of the same gift as being yet future, "The bread " "which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the " "life of the world.'" (35 4.) Is Christ's body now being

given, His blood now being shed? This certainly is incredible. In another place Dr Pusey says, 'Since, then, it was His true 'body which was given *for* us upon the cross, it is His true 'body which is given *to* us in the sacrament.' (33 16.)

11. If we take the phrase not figuratively but literally, the body whose blood was shed is the one sacrificed on the cross, and the blood described as shed, is that of Christ, whose human life was extinct. If, then, this body and this blood of Christ are present in the Lord's Supper, the act of literal sacrificing is repeated. This is the modern Roman Catholic doctrine. Most of the Ritualists, however, contend that the sacrifice is not repeated, but perpetuated or continued. But this is directly contrary to a literal interpretation of the words of institution. If the words must be taken literally and not figuratively, then in every due celebration, there is the actual sacrificing or slaying of the victim. It should be borne in mind that Christ gave His flesh (John vi. 51.) His living body to be slain on the cross, and the shedding of blood is the usual way in which Scripture expresses the act of ceasing to live. The apostle Paul expressly states that the action in the Lord's Supper shows forth or declares the Lord's death (1 Cor. xi. 26); that is, that He once died. To suppose this act could be continued or perpetuated is absurd in the extreme; and to conceive that the actual dying is repeated in every due celebration of the Eucharist, would require Christ to have an indefinite number of bodies, and capable of dying many thousand times a-day.

12. Dr Pusey, however, seems to give the preference to the continuation or perpetuation theory, for he says 'the act is a 'present act.' This is one out of many of his extraordinary acts of faith, but it is founded upon a worthless criticism. Others, who have no sympathy with Dr Pusey's sacramental notions, have taken the above terms as really denoting an absolute present time. A man who reads his Greek Testament without any knowledge of the original language of the Old Testament, may perhaps be pardoned for such a freak of interpretation, but it is positively inexcusable in one who professes to read his Hebrew bible, and is a royal professor of the language of that wonderful book.

13. Winer says, 'The present tense is used only in appearance for the future when an action still future is mentioned as already present, either because it is unalterably determined, or is about to take place by some unchanging arrangement, as Matt. xxvi. 2. "After two days *is* the passover and the "Son of Man *is* betrayed."'—(*Gram.* N. T. p. 280.) Other instances of a similar use of the present tense occur in this chapter. 'The Master saith I *do* keep the passover, v. 18. 'The Son of Man *is* betrayed into the hands of sinners; 'behold he is at hand that *doth* betray me, vs. 45, 46. St. Mark expresses the same thing thus, 'The Son of man *is* delivered up to the hands of sinners. . . . he that *is* delivering me up (*ὁ παραδίδως*) is at hand.' (Mark xiv. 41, 42.) St. Luke is still more to the point: 'But behold, the hand of him *delivering* me up is with me on the table. . . . by whom he *is being* delivered up.'—(xxii. 21, 22.) In all these phrases, as in those on which Dr. Pusey lays so much stress, we have the present tense, but from the context we are compelled to understand it in every instance as absolutely relating to the future. According to the style of the New Testament language, we are not obliged to take the phrases adduced by Dr Pusey as relating to the then present time, but if necessity so requires as relating only to the future. Now necessity does so require in the phrase 'blood which *is* shed,' (Matt. xxvi. 28, Mark xiv. 24, and Luke xxii. 20,) for it is certain that when our Lord uttered those words, His blood was not shed and no ancient Father ever pretended that it was. Of course our Lord could speak as Jehovah does in the Old Testament of things future as if they were now being done, or were done, because they *were certain* to come to pass.

14. In the Old Testament, blood is said to be the life, (Lev. xvii. 11, Deut. xii. 23), and he who takes away life, or he who has it taken away, is said to shed blood, or to have his blood shed (Gen. ix. 6, xxxvii. 22; Lev. xvii. 4; Num. xxxv. 33, and Deut. xxi. 7-9.) The same mode of speech is retained in the New Testament (Matt. xxiii. 30-35; Rom. iii. 15.) When, therefore, Christ speaks of His blood being shed, He makes use of a Hebrew expression to denote that life is

taken away. Strictly speaking, our blessed Lord did not die in consequence of loss of blood, but when He says His blood is shed, we are certain He means the giving up of His life. When Christ said 'this is my blood which *is* shed for you,' He did not mean to tell His disciples that He *was* then dead, that His life *was* then given up, but that it very soon would be, as we know it was. And if the shedding of His blood, or the giving up of His life had not actually taken place, but was a matter of the future; so also, was the giving up of His body. 'This is my body which is given for you.' (Luke xxii. 19.) He is here referring to Himself not as actually given up, but about to be given up to be crucified (John iii. 16.) To Himself as giving His life a ransom for all. (Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, Gal. i. 4, 1 Tim. ii. 6, and Tit. ii. 14).

15. The cup, or the wine in it, could not be His shed blood, because it was not shed. The bread could not be His body which was given to be sacrificed, because that solemn event had not then taken place. The Christian Passover, like the Jewish, whose place it took, was commemorative of a most wonderful event, and as in the case of the Jewish Passover, it was instituted at a given time before the event; the institution and the event are absolutely separate and distinct. But Dr Pusey's interpretation of the texts in question confounds the one with the other, and makes these striking and beautiful statements incomprehensible, if not absurd. In this his private interpretation he is contrary to all antiquity. Both in the most ancient and more modern Latin versions, instead of the phrase 'is shed,' we find the phrase, 'shall be shed' (*effundetur*), instead of 'is given,' 'is broken,' we have 'shall be delivered' (*tradetur*.) We find it so in the writings of Irenæus (8 6), Origen (11 12, 30.), Jerome (18 20), Paschasius (33 15, 16). Dr Pusey has succeeded no better than M. Harding in finding work for a sacrificing priest.

16. But as Dr Pusey has assumed that the words of institution are to be regarded as a will or testament, and must be so interpreted, and as he has given what he considers to be the true interpretation thereof, each of these points shall receive our best attention.

17. Four separate accounts are given of the institution of

the Lord's Supper, and as each comes from a divine and infallible source, there can be no question as to the propriety of choosing for consideration the fuller account as given by St. Paul, who says,—

‘For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, ‘Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.’ (1 Cor. xi. 23-28.)

18. Dr Pusey requires these words to be regarded as a will or testament (35 14), and when we remember that our Lord was about to leave His disciples, and that He was making special provision for them in His absence, it is not unsuitable to regard the act as testamentary; but the things bequeathed are memorials, tokens of remembrance, to use the language of several Fathers, and especially that ascribed to Jerome. ‘He left His last remembrance or memorial with us. Just as if one travelling into another country should leave a pledge with him whom he loved, that whenever he looked upon it, he might call to mind his favours and friendship, which such a person, if he perfectly loved him, could not behold without great grief or weeping. The Saviour delivered this sacrament that by it we may always bring to mind that He died for us.’ (18 65.) Bertram, in correcting the heresy of Paschasius, is still more to our point. (See 25 64, 65.)

19. Dr Pusey says, ‘Human principles of interpretation require that we should believe that a testator means what he says.’ (35 14.) Of course, and if he left a token of remembrance of himself, it must not be understood that he left *himself*; to use the language of Dr Pusey, ‘under the form of’ the token, and that he is ‘supernaturally, ineffably, but verily and indeed present;’ (35 61.), especially if in connection with such a bequest he spoke of himself as being

absent. It is plain our Lord did not teach that His body or Himself would be in the tokens of remembrance, for His true and faithful servant Paul showed that these tokens were to comfort His disciples in His absence 'till He come.' It is true our Lord calls the memorials by the names of the things of which they were the memorials, namely, His body and blood. But this, we shall have occasion to notice, was the uniform practice of all Hebrew antiquity, and of the Jews for whom He first appointed the memorials. The apostle Paul, under the special direction of his blessed Master, as if to prevent the Corinthians, who were originally heathens, from misunderstanding the Jewish sacramental language, calls the memorials not by that which they signified, but by their own proper names, descriptive of what they really were, viz., bread and wine. Our Lord called the bread His body once, and the wine His blood once, but His servant Paul, in one breath, calls the same things three times successively by their real proper names; that is, bread and cup, meaning, of course, by cup the wine it contained. Is it conceivable that St. Paul, with the exalted conception he had of his divine Lord, and before whose glory and bright presence he had been struck blind, could call those two things which Dr Pusey and his school believe each to be Christ's body, soul, and divinity, by those ordinary compound materials, bread and wine, if he had had the remotest conception that the consecrated bread and wine were any such things. We think it incredible. But this is but a trifle for the extraordinary faith of Dr Pusey in comparison of some other acts of his faith which have to be considered.

20. He has adopted still more important rules by which he would interpret our Lord's words, as may be seen (35 22). All these rules compel Dr Pusey, if he acts upon them himself, to understand the word body simply and really as body, and the blood simply and really as blood; and, as the blood was without the body, so was the body at that time without the blood or life, and consequently the body was without the human soul or spirit. To quote the words of Theodoret—'Our Lord did not say this is my divinity, but this is my 'body.' Nor did He wish it to be understood that it was His

divinity. When 'showing the type of His passion, He did 'not, therefore, call to mind His divinity' (23 41, 49), nor did He intend to call it to mind. How can Dr Pusey violate his own adopted rules and understand, for instance, that when Christ said, 'This is my blood,' He also meant to say that it was also His soul. The shed blood, as we have seen, was a certain sign of death, at which time His soul or human spirit was in Paradise in Hades. Of course, when Christ's blood was not shed, when His life was not sacrificed, then it might be said, as Dr Pusey says, 'Where Christ's body is, 'there must His soul be also, there also His divinity' (35 68). But this in no wise could be true of His soul or human spirit when His blood was shed, when His life was sacrificed.

21. Beside the instances in which the term body is applied to our Lord in connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper, there are in all sixteen other instances in the four gospels. In every case it applies to His material organization, and to that only. In two cases His body is said to be anointed 'to the burying,' in another He speaks 'of the temple of His body.' In the remaining thirteen cases His body is spoken of as dead. If we take the term blood literally, as Dr Pusey professes to do, how can it be understood from any portion of the New Testament to mean anything but blood, and blood only?

22. We shall now consider Dr Pusey's own interpretation of the words in question. He tells us plainly that Christ's presence 'is not according to the natural presence of our 'Lord's human flesh, which is at the right hand of God.' (35 10). 'Since, then, it was His true body which was given *for* us upon the cross, it is His true body which is given *to* us in the sacrament. The manner of the presence of the body is different.' (35 16). 'It is a great mystery of His 'love that, being for ever, in His natural mode of existence, in 'His human body at the right hand of God, He should invent, 'so to speak, another mode of existence of His body and blood, 'a spiritual existence. He is not present in the same mode 'of existence, in the heavens and on the altar. But by a 'divine virtue He raises His body above the condition of a

‘body and gives it a supernatural mode of existence.’ (35 67). ‘But, then, the same body which is locally at the right hand of God, is supralocally, under a different mode of existence, present with us, really, truly, substantially, though ‘spiritually.’ (35 68).

23. All these different modes of presence for the real body of Christ are silly human inventions, without the slightest foundation. The consecrated elements in the Eucharist, viewed as memorials, have special relation to an event of short duration,—namely, the actual dying of Christ, the bread representing the body of Christ given, the wine representing the shed blood of Christ. To speak of the real presence of that body and of that blood is absurd, because in that condition they no longer exist; that solemn and profoundly interesting event may be brought to mind by memorials, but actually to reproduce it would necessitate the crucifying of the Son of God afresh, and the shedding of His blood at each commemoration. Still, as we have undertaken to follow Dr Pusey everywhere in his Eucharistic doctrines, we shall follow him here, although it is really a work of supererogation.

24. In the above extracts from his writings we see that he admits that our Lord’s body, now at the right hand of God, has a natural presence, by which, of course, we understand that, like human bodies, it cannot be undivided and in many places at the same time. But, it may be asked, how can Christ’s real body and blood be present in the consecrated elements, so present in them in all parts of the world, and so present in each infinitesimal part of the elements that a communicant, whether saint or sinner, receives in the smallest portion of bread a whole Christ, body, soul, and divinity, and the same in each drop of wine.

25. Mr Shipley says, ‘Over and over again, in the smallest portion as in the largest, there must be the same body and blood, the same Christ whole and undivided.’ (39 12). Dr Pusey states, ‘Ere He left earth, He contrived a way whereby He should be continually present on earth,—present not as when on earth, in one single place, but throughout the whole earth, wherever Christians are.’ (35 68).

26. To meet this exigency, of Christ's body really being present in a million places in the same moment of time, Dr Pusey has adopted an unnatural mode of presence of human invention; and, what is most painful, he says, as we have seen above, that Christ 'invented' or 'contrived' it, but does not tell us when or where He did it, unless when He said, 'this is my body,' 'this is my blood.' But to suppose that Christ made such an invention, or effected such a contrivance as Dr Pusey distinctly ascribes to Him, is outrageous in the extreme, and here he more grossly than ever violates his own adopted rules. Our blessed Lord had but one body, and when He uttered the simple words, 'This is my body,' even if we suppose He meant His real body, and not a memorial of it, He could not mean any indefinite number of bodies; but how the blood could be a body at all, much less an indefinite number of bodies, we are utterly at a loss to conceive. If the world were converted to-morrow, and the event were celebrated by one simultaneous universal Eucharistic feast, every communicant might receive the memorials of Christ's body and blood; but to suppose that every one would also receive the entire body of Christ, is indulging a foolish fancy without either reason or revelation to guide it. Some heretics in the early Church denied that our blessed Lord had a body at all. In reply to such, St. John appealed to the ordinary senses which God has giving us, saying, 'That which 'we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we 'have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word 'of Life' (1 John i. 1). From this we learn distinctly what St. John understood by the presence of a real body. In the case of our blessed Lord's body, it was capable of being heard to speak, of being seen, looked upon, and felt—all characteristics of a body.

27. But Dr Pusey and his school maintain the presence of the same real body in the consecrated elements, without pretending that they have any one of the above proofs, or any proof whatever of the kind. In this strange dilemma, Dr Pusey and his friends seek refuge in 'a miracle the most marvellous.' (35 67.) We deny that there is any miracle whatever. A miracle of the New Testament is a peculiar and

unaccountable phenomenon cognizant to the human mind through the medium of the senses, but not to be accounted for by any known laws, or anything within the range of human experience or observation. Our blessed Lord and His holy apostles performed acts of this kind, and the people marvelled greatly, as well they might. But these miracles, according to Dr Pusey, are quite put into the shade by the miracle performed in the consecration of the elements, for this he declares to be 'the most marvellous of miracles.' There must, then, be some prodigious wonder to marvel at. But who are they who marvel? the angels, or departed spirits? or both? It would be presumptuous for Dr Pusey or any one else to pretend to know their minds. Men only remain, and do they marvel? No, certainly not, and for the best of all reasons, there is nothing whatever to marvel at. Let the priest who consecrates the elements be of the apostolical succession, so called, and let the consecration be in our Lord's words, the conditions Dr Pusey requires in order to the effecting of this most marvellous of miracles, (35 67) yet we maintain there is no sign, no unaccountable phenomenon, nothing to produce wonder or amazement; no change whatever has taken place in regard to the consecrated elements that human ken can discern. So far, then, from this being 'the most marvellous of miracles,' if those of our Lord had been in no manner different from this, they never could have been recorded as miracles, because no one could have been cognizant of them.

27. We shall conclude this chapter by contrasting the truly literal interpretation of our Lord's words with Dr Pusey's assumed literal interpretation of them. 'This is my body which is given for you.' (Luke xxii. 19.) 'This is my blood of the new testament,' or 'the new testament in my blood.' (Matt. xxvi. 28, and Luke xxii. 20.) Our Lord says, if we must take His words literally, that the cup, or rather what it contained, was just as much the New Testament as it was His blood. This point will be fully explained in the next chapter. The body, as we have seen (sec. 11) appears in the Eucharist in two aspects. As living, for He gave, or sacrificed His living body on the cross. And as dead, for the shed blood was that

of a slain or sacrificed body. In fact, an actual dying is called to mind ; but if the words must be taken literally, as Dr Pusey contends, then in every celebration of the Eucharist, the actual death of Christ is effected. When then Christ said, 'This is my blood,' if we must take His word literally, the blood was blood simply, blood only, shed blood ; and therefore, as we know, was the blood of one not then alive. Such is the simple and literal interpretation of the words in question, if indeed they must be taken literally.

28. But Dr Pusey's literal interpretation of them is as remote from this as possible. Quoting the words, 'This is my body given for you,' he remarks, 'Since then it was His body which was given for us upon the cross, it is His body which is given to us in the sacrament.' (35 16.) So far so good for a literal interpretation. But the body given for us on the cross and laid in the sepulchre, could be apprehended by the ordinary senses, was carnal, that is of flesh, physical, material, and visible, and was present on the cross and in the sepulchre, carnally, materially, visibly, physically, and bodily. Yet, Dr Pusey interprets our Lord's words as teaching that the sacramental elements 'become His body and blood spiritually,' (35 1.) and that in the sacrament they 'are present rather sacramentally, really, spiritually.' (35 61.) But our Lord, he considers, invented another 'mode of existence of His body and blood, a spiritual existence, a spiritual mode of existence, as a spirit invisible and indivisible.' (35 67.) He says, 'we cannot infer that our blessed Lord's words convey His whole teaching.' (35 9.) 'Where His body is, there must His soul be also, there also His divinity.' (35 68.) This last statement is quite true of Christ's living body, but not true of His Body whose blood was shed and its soul in Hades.

29. Our Lord's words, then, paraphrased so as to give Dr Pusey's literal acceptance of them, are as follow :—'This is my body, not my present material substantial and visible body, but a spiritual, invisible, and indivisible body, and which is present not after the manner of my present body, that is materially, substantially, visibly, but present after another mode of existence which I have invented, namely, a spiritual existence, as a spirit. Nor is this my body only, but also

‘my soul, and my divinity, and this is my body, as thus explained, which is given for you.’

30. We ask, could all, or any one of these things be predicated of the body which was suspended on the cross and laid in the sepulchre. Our blessed Lord says, ‘my body which is ‘given for you.’ Whatever the body was, or whatever was meant by it, that body was slain on the cross and laid in the sepulchre, and its soul was in Hades. Did our Lord then give a spiritual, invisible, immaterial body, and not His body only, but also His soul and divinity, to be slain on the cross, and laid in the sepulchre? When the body was given, divinity was not given, the body did not give itself, but was given by the divinity, for the Lord Himself said, ‘The bread that I will ‘give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.’ (John vi. 51.) What the early Church taught upon this point we have already seen. (Sec. 20.)

31. Respecting the shed blood of our blessed Lord, Dr Pusey, like the Roman Catholic authors, says as little as possible. But all that Dr Pusey has affirmed of Christ’s body, if true, might also be affirmed of His shed blood. In fact, this is what the Romanists do affirm, who with Dr Pusey, pretend to take the words of institution literally. Thus their literal interpretation of the words, ‘This is my blood,’ as given by St Matthew and St Mark, is, ‘This is my body, soul, and ‘divinity.’ With them and the Ritualists generally, every communicant, whether saint or sinner, in receiving his portion of the consecrated wine, receives whole Christ, God, and man. But the words, ‘This cup is the New Testament in my blood, as given by St Luke and St Paul, Romanists interpret figuratively. Thus, Chadse, a Roman Catholic champion, in his disputation with Peter Martyr at Oxford, said, ‘Whereas Luke ‘and Paul spake figuratively, the other two evangelists said ‘flatly, “This is my blood.”’—(*Common Places of Peter Martyr, after part iv. p. 201.*) Such also were the sentiments of Lapide. (See ch. iii. 68, 69.) But strange to say, Dr Pusey understands the entire words of institution figuratively as well as literally. (See 35 47.) Verily this Romish heresy is pregnant with contradictory and unaccountable beliefs.

CHAPTER III.

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN RELATION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT OR COVENANT EXAMINED AND CONSIDERED IN CONNECTION WITH THE USE OF THE WORD COVENANT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, WITH AN EXPOSURE OF DR WISEMAN'S AND DR PUSEY'S MISINTERPRETATION OF THE WORD COVENANT, AND ITS TRUE RELATION SET FORTH AS EXPLANATORY AND ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE FIGURATIVE OR ELLIPTICAL CHARACTER OF THE WORDS, 'THIS CUP IS THE NEW TESTAMENT IN MY BLOOD.' THE EXTREME DIFFICULTY WHICH BELIEVERS IN THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS HAVE IN GIVING A CONSISTENT AND HARMONIOUS INTERPRETATION TO THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION IN RELATION TO THE CUP. CORNELIUS A LAPIDE ADDUCED AS AN INSTANCE. THE SACRAMENTAL PHRASEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, MORE ESPECIALLY THAT OF BAPTISM CONSIDERED AS CONFIRMATORY AND ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF THE ORDINANCE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER; WHEREIN ALSO IS SHOWN THE MISCONCEPTIONS OF HIGH CHURCH ANGLICANS IN REGARD TO THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM.

1. THE next point which comes under our consideration is the symbolical or figurative character of certain parts of Holy Scripture; or, in other words, the mystical or sacramental nature of certain divinely instituted rites and ceremonies. Our object is to see if we can discover any definite rule or rules whereby we may harmoniously and consistently interpret not a part merely, but the whole of such parts of Scripture.

2. Such words as mystery, mystical, and their equivalents, sacrament and sacramental, not being applied in Holy Scripture to the Lord's Supper, but by early Christian authors at a subsequent period, the account of their origin and use belongs rather to the patristic testimony and is given in ch. ix.

3. It is a fault with Dr Pusey and his school to interpret the sacramental words and sentences of the Eucharist, not in harmony with, but opposed to, similar words and sentences in the Word of God. For instance in the Eucharist, regarding the converted elements as signs, symbols, figures, types, &c.,

he believes the signs to be really and substantially what they signify, the symbols to be what they symbolize, the figures to be what they figure, the types to be what they typify, &c., and the sentences containing these terms in dispute, 'This is my body,' 'this is my blood,' not as we should say sacramental, but plain, literal, phrases. But this, as we shall see, is contrary to the entire analogy of Holy Scripture.

4. From very early times, and by Augustine in particular, it has been admitted that in Holy Scripture the instances are very numerous in which signs or symbols take the names of the things which they signify or symbolize. Dr Wiseman has given the most important of these, and to them the reader is referred. (34 13.) Dr Pusey *plainly* admits that the consecrated elements are signs, and that in accordance with Augustine's rule they take the names of the things which they signify. (35 47.) Here, then, we charge Dr Pusey and his school with giving a private interpretation to the two signs in the Lord's Supper, which is contrary to the analogy of Scripture, nor can it be rationally supposed that the terms 'ears of corn,' 'kine,' 'horns,' 'field,' 'seed,' 'tares,' 'harvest,' 'reapers,' 'rock,' 'stars,' 'beasts,' &c., &c., as signs, have in or under them *really* and *substantially* the things of which they are signs. And why should bread and wine be exceptional cases?

5. Dr Waterland has admitted that these metaphorical words 'do not come up to the point in hand,' which Dr Pusey twists thus. 'He gives up as *untenable* the application of all metaphorical locutions. (35 43). Waterland says, 'they do not come up to the point in hand.' How far, then, do they come. As far as we have shown in ch. x, namely, that Holy Scripture commonly calls signs by the names of the things which they signify, and that the signs of bread and wine are cases in point, as the Fathers teach, and Dr Pusey admits. They do come up towards the mark and are tenable thus far. But what are the cases which in the judgment of Waterland do come up to the mark? 'Similar and parallel to the expressions made use of by our Lord in the institution.' These are Waterland's own words. Respecting his leaving the cases which he considered as not coming up to

the mark and adducing those that do, Dr Pusey observes, 'When any have got thus far, little, I imagine, remains to be done. Our Lord's words will, I believe, carry their own conviction, except where there is a strong contrary prejudice; and where there is, argument avails little, and God's enlightening grace must do all.' (35 44). This is a curious answer to give to Dean Goode and Waterland, for it is the former who quotes the latter with approval. Groundless airs of assumption of this kind form one of the most unseemly features in Dr Pusey's writings on the Eucharist.

6. The expressions that do come up to the mark, viz., sacramental words and phrases analogous to the Lord's Supper, now in their turn are to be considered. It should be borne in mind that the Lord's Supper has relation not only to the Jewish Passover, whose place it takes, and of which it is the antitype, but also to Jewish sacrifices strictly propitiatory. The words of institution respecting the bread and the Lord's body more especially relate to the Passover feast; and the words respecting the cup and the Lord's blood as especially relate to the ratification of the old covenant by blood and the great day of atonement. We shall find it more interesting and instructive to consider these two points separately, as each admits of distinct illustration and confirmation from the Old Testament. We shall commence with the words of institution in relation to the cup.

7. Sacraments, like signs in Holy Scripture, receive the names of the things of which they are the sacraments, but are not really and substantially the things themselves. In consideration of our opponents' and our own convenience, we shall here refer to the testimony of the early fathers, and of Augustine in particular, as collated in a subsequent chapter, (Ch. x.)

8. According to Holy Scripture itself, and as interpreted by the fathers, we must believe that sacraments take the names of the things of which they are the sacraments, and are not the things themselves; and that the sacrament or sacraments of the Lord's Supper are cases in point, and not exceptional ones. That, in fact, as all the fathers teach, the words of institution in relation both to Christ's body and His blood, are figurative or elliptical phrases. It is not necessary for us to translate

these figures or supply the ellipses with perfect accuracy ; it will be sufficient for our purpose if, from the analogy of Scripture, we demonstrate that in no case sacraments, or sacramental signs, *are, become, or contain* really and substantially the things of which they are the sacraments, or the sacramental signs.

9. It is of importance to bear in mind that our blessed Lord did not institute His Supper more than once, and that the language he used was not the Greek, but the Syro-Chaldaic. We have four distinct accounts of its institution, each having verbal differences. Two accounts are much fuller than the other two. We accept each separately but harmoniously with the others, and all collectively as teaching the truth of God.

10. As our blessed Lord, in the words of institution, alluded to what was felt to be of profound interest to believing Jews, viz., God's covenant with them, and its ratification by blood, it will be most suitable to begin at this point ; and in the remainder of this chapter we shall confine ourselves to that part of the phraseology employed in the institution of the Lord's Supper relating to the word covenant, and illustrate and explain it by the like phraseology, or sacramental language, both of the Old and New Testament.

11. St Matthew relates this part of the institution thus : 'For this is my blood of the new covenant.' (xxvi. 28). St Mark gives the same words. (xiv. 24). St Luke, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood.' (xxii. 20). St Paul employs the same phrase. (1 Cor. xi. 25). The meaning of these phrases, when divested of figure and given fully, is—'This wine is the memorial of my blood by which the new covenant is ratified.' 'This wine is the memorial of the new covenant ratified in my blood.'

12. Regarding, as we must, the act of the shedding of Christ's blood, and the purpose for which it was shed, as that which is especially to be kept in remembrance, the two phrases, though different in words, are identical in meaning.

13. The phrase, 'This is my blood,' is, in fact, the language of Moses. With him it was figure and type ; in Christ it is substance and antitype. Moses said, 'Behold the blood of the covenant' (Ex. xxiv. 8). In the Epistle to the Hebrews this covenant is alluded to as the old covenant, and as dedicated

with blood. (Heb. ix. 18.) The blood of the covenant means the blood by which the covenant (viz., the assent on the part of the people to obey the laws proposed) was ratified. But we learn from the same Epistle that the new covenant was also ratified or sanctioned by blood, not that of slain animals, but that of Christ; and this, of course, is what our Lord expressly names in the words of institution, as given above.

14. Aquinas, one of the greatest doctors the Roman Catholic Church can boast of, in his commentary on the words, 'This is the blood of the covenant which God hath enjoined unto you' (Heb. ix. 20), says, 'namely, the confirmer of the covenant (*confirmator testamenti*)—for this blood was a figure of the blood of Christ by which the new covenant was confirmed; and, therefore, Christ used these words, "This is the blood of the new covenant" (Matt. xxvi. 28), namely, confirmative.' *Com. in omnes Pauli Epis.*, p. 487.

15. Again, on the words, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood' (1 Cor. xi. 25), he observes—

'Whence also we read that Moses, having taken the blood and sprinkled it on the people, said, "This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you." (Ex. xxiv. 8.) As, therefore, the Old Testament or covenant was confirmed by the figurative blood of bulls, so the New Testament or covenant was confirmed by the blood of Christ which was shed in His passion; and in this cup is contained sacramentally. . . . Which [new covenant] was confirmed by the blood of the death of Christ. And, therefore, the Lord says concerning this thing, "This is the new covenant in my blood;" that is, by that which is contained in this cup is commemorated the new covenant confirmed by the blood of Christ.' (*Ibid.*, p. 169.)

16. Nicolas de Lyra on Ex. xxiv., 8, says, 'This blood was the sign of the reception of the law by the people and of the covenant between themselves and God.' On the words, 'This is the blood of the covenant' (Heb. ix. 20), he remarks, 'That is, the blood confirmative and commemorative of the covenant.' From these two Roman Catholic authors we learn that the phrase, 'Blood of the new covenant,' is elliptical, and, in full, is, 'Blood confirmative and commemorative of the new covenant.'

17. Another like elliptical phrase is, 'This is my covenant which ye shall keep, &c., every man child among you shall be circumcised,' (Gen. xvii. 10.) Again, 'The children of

‘Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel.’ (Ex. xxxi. 16, 17.) In truth, neither circumcision nor the Sabbath was God’s covenant, but each was a token thereof; and, according to the plain rules so clearly stated and fully illustrated, to which we have already referred, the sign or sacrament takes the name of that of which it is a sign or sacrament. The meaning of each phrase fully expressed is, ‘This is [the token of] my covenant,’ ‘a perpetual [token or condition of the] covenant.’

18. Now, if this interpretation be correct, which, until very recently, it was universally supposed to be, such elliptical phrases in general sacramental rites in the Old Testament is strong presumptive evidence that the like sacramental phrases of the New Testament should be interpreted in the same manner. That the word testament or covenant, in two instances out of the four accounts of the institution of the Lord’s Supper must be so interpreted is all but universally admitted. But if one-half of the words of institution in relation to the covenant must be so interpreted, can the other half admit of any other interpretation? And if so large a portion of the words of institution is confessedly elliptical, may not the whole be elliptical, especially as the style of speech is in the exact form of the sacramental language of the Old Testament? How forcibly and conclusively Zwingle employed the elliptical phrase of Gen. xvii. 10, may be seen on referring to 29 24. Drs Wiseman and Pusey felt this kind of biblical interpretation so keenly, especially in its application to the words of institution, that, notwithstanding their professed regard for antiquity and universal consent, in defiance thereof they set up their own private and novel opinions, and strive to prove that the word covenant is never used in the Old Testament elliptically for its sign, token, or condition, &c. We have no objection to their opinions on the ground that they are private and novel; but the question is, are they correct? are they founded on the plain teaching of Holy Scripture, to which they both appeal? This is the point now to be investigated, and its extreme importance in the present controversy is an ample reason for its full examination.

19. We shall begin by examining Dr Wiseman's three antagonistic interpretations of the word covenant. 1st, He argues that Gen. xvii. 10, is not a case in point, because in the verse following it is explained to be a token of the covenant. (34 21.) He asks, is the eleventh verse 'an explanation of 'the tenth : so that *is* really corresponds to *represents*? Certainly not.' (34 21.) But here we must protest against his misrepresentation of his opponent's words. It is not maintained that circumcision 'is (that is represents) the covenant.' There is nothing corresponding to 'is' in the original. It is maintained that circumcision is a token of the covenant, and not, as misrepresented, '*merely* the symbol or emblem,' 'a *bare* 'and *empty* symbol.' (34 22.) The token was also a condition, and of great moment, to God's people. To neglect it was to break the covenant, and involved being cut off from His people.

20. Dr Wiseman's second interpretation, which destroys the first, is that 'circumcision is actually the instrument whereby 'the covenant between God and His people was at once executed 'and recorded.' Again, that circumcision is the 'act of the covenant taking the word "act" in both its meanings of its execution and its record.' And he tells us that this sort of thing 'was according to the established law of every language and 'country.' (34 22.)

21. To this there is certainly one exception, viz., the Hebrew language and the country of God's ancient people. Circumcision was in no sense the execution of the covenant; it was executed but once, and once for all. Circumcision, as we have seen, and as is admitted, was a token of the covenant, and without which token no one could be partakers of the covenant; and in that view was a very important condition of the covenant. But the covenant was executed, or made with, Abraham, and through him with his posterity, and it was executed or concluded after this manner. Victims were sacrificed, and cut into parts, between which the contracting parties were accustomed to pass. (Gen. xv.) The making or executing of this covenant never appears to have been repeated; it was confirmed, as we have seen, by Moses, and St Peter addressed his fellow-countrymen as 'the children of the covenant which

‘God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.’ (Acts iii. 25.)

22. Dr Wiseman flounders still more when he says, ‘This (his) interpretation is fully borne out by what follows: “He who is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and *my covenant shall be in your flesh* for an everlasting covenant.”’ (34 22.) The covenant here is not properly the covenant, but the sign of it.

23. Both Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey, as we shall see, set aside the plain teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures, as it is recognized in all our Hebrew lexicons. By far the most important of these are the lexicons of Gesenius and Fuerst, and from these, extracts shall now be given, beginning with the Thesaurus of Gesenius.

24. Under the Hebrew term, translated covenant, he gives, I. The supposed origin of the term, as derived from a verb signifying to cut, and states,—

‘That in concluding solemn covenants the contracting parties were accustomed to pass through the divided victims. That *the covenant of* any one is the covenant made by, or with him. “Then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember.” “But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors.” (Lev. xxvi. 42, 45.) But specially and very frequently spoken of the covenant instituted between God and Abraham (Gen. xv., xvii.), in the memory and testimony of which circumcision was instituted. (Gen. xvii. 10, *seq.*) Afterwards confirmed by Moses (Ex. xxiv. 7, 8, xxxiv. 27; Deut. v. 2) to be renewed and ennobled in after times through the intervention of prophets and the Messiah (Is. xlii. 6, xlix. 8); Messiah (Mal. iii. 1); renewed and amended (Jer. xxxi. 33). . . . The blood of victims, by the sprinkling of which the covenant was ratified, is called the “blood of the covenant” (Ex. xxiv. 8; Zech. ix. 11), whence (Matt. xxvi. 28) the blood of Jesus Christ, by which the new covenant is confirmed, Mark xiv. 24; Heb. xiii. 20.’

‘25. II. Elsewhere it often signifies *the condition* of this covenant, viz., a) *the covenant promise* of God. (Is. lix. 21, b.) Oftener *the precepts* of God to be observed by Israel, that is, the Divine law, tables of the law, the ark in which the law, that is, the tables of the law, were kept (Deut. ix. 9, 15); the words of the law (Jer. xi. 2-8, xxxiv. 18; Exod. xxxiv. 28); the precepts of the law, the ten precepts, the book of the law, &c.’

‘26. III. Sometimes elliptically, that is, *the messenger of the* (new)

'*covenant*, its interpreter, that is, the introducer of a new law and new dispensation, by the servant of God [the Messiah], Is. xlii. 6 ; xlix. 8, comp. Mal. iii. 1.'

'27. IV. *The token of a covenant.* That is circumcision. Gen. xvii. 10. "This covenant," comp. ver. 13: "my covenant shall be in "your flesh," more fully comp. ver. 11, "and it shall be a token of "a covenant betwixt me and you." There were two covenants, that 'is, tokens of covenants, one of the Sabbath, another of circumcision. 'Exod. xxxi. 16.'

28. Of the same Hebrew term translated covenant, Fuerst states—

'Properly cutting in pieces of the sacrificial animal, hence metaphorically, *covenant league*, Gen. xxi. 27, from the custom of going between the parts of the cut animals, and therefore to *make a covenant* 'is to cut [make] a covenant, Gen. xxvi. 28 ; xxxi. 44 ; Ex. xxxiv. 10 . . . In the widest sense *covenant* denotes a contract between 'nations, Josh. ix. 6, friends, 1 Sam. xviii. 3, married persons, Mal. 'ii. 14; but especially does it denote the covenant of God with the 'fathers, which is named "the covenant of thy fathers," Deut. iv. 31, 'or "the covenant of their ancestors," Lev. xxvi. 45, or the 'covenant 'of God with Israel generally, Jos. vii. 11 ; Ps. cxxxii. 12 ; in which 'sense the things promised in the covenant, the things that are the 'media of what is promised, the objects that constitute the conditions 'of the covenant, and the signs themselves are called *covenant*. For 'example *covenant land*, Ez. xxx. 5, *i.e.* Palestine (comp. Heb. xi. 9), '*messenger of the covenant*, Mal. iii. 1, *i.e.*, Messiah. As designations 'of the law, *tables of the covenant*, Deut. ix. 9, *ark of the covenant*, 'Josh. iii. 6, *book of the covenant*, Ex. xxiv. 7 ; 2 Kings xxiii. 21, the 'ten commandments, Ex. xxxiv. 28, frequently occur. As a sign of 'the covenant, *covenant* is circumcision, Gen. xvii. 10, and so in 'Dan. xi. 30, 32, as peculiar to the later diction.'

29. The reader should note well that the novel and private interpretation which Dr Wiseman would fix on the term covenant to suit his purpose, derives no support from these leading Hebrew lexicographers, no ; nor from what can be quoted from them, nor from a critical examination of the term in question in any place in which it occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures. The very thing he would explain away is most emphatically maintained by them, viz., that the term *covenant* is occasionally used for the phrase, *token of the covenant*, viz., circumcision.

30. Rosenmüller, one of the authorities to which Dr Wiseman appeals, remarks on the words, 'this is my covenant,' (Gen. xvii. 10). 'Therefore circumcision must be the mark 'of God's covenant with Abraham, and by which both Abra-

‘ham himself and his posterity were admitted into the fellowship of the covenant.’ Dathius an author of a critical Latin translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, whom Rosenmüller for the most part follows, translates the latter part of the 13th ver. thus, ‘This mark of my covenant in your body shall be perpetual.’ (*signum hoc fœderis mei in corpore vestro erit perpetuum*). The word covenant occurs twice in the sentence; and its use and meaning in both instances are identical. The full sense may be given as follows, ‘the token of my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting token of a covenant.’

31. Chrysostom, in his homily on these words, interprets the words, ‘everlasting covenant,’ in the sense of a perpetual memorial. ‘Therefore having given them a perpetual memorial, he put around them the mark of circumcision as a certain bond.’ *In Gen. Hom. xxxix., Tom. II., p. 567.* But what is still more to our point, Cornelius à-Lapide, a very learned Roman Catholic commentator, a zealous defender of the doctrine of transubstantiation against such men as Calvin and Zwingli, and who maintains the doctrines of the Council of Trent, and writes under the influence of its very terrible anathemas, has, by anticipation, flatly contradicted Dr Wiseman. On the words, ‘This is my covenant,’ (Gen. xvii. 10), explains, ‘This is a sign of the covenant now entered into with thee, is plain from what follows.’

32. We come now to Dr Wiseman’s third interpretation, which makes a hash of the other two. Giving up his appeal ‘to the established law of every language and country, and ‘foreign treaties,’ he says, ‘I am led by a more minute examination of Scripture phraseology, to adopt a third [interpretation], I have no hesitation in saying that the verb *is* must ‘be taken quite literally’ (34 23). He means it must not be understood in the sense of represents. The word in question does not exist in the original, and consequently our version has given it in italics. He adds, ‘and the pronoun *this* ‘referred not to *circumcision* or its idea, but to the latter ‘member of the sentence, “This is my covenant which ye shall “keep between me and thee . . . every male child among “you shall be circumcised.” As if one said, “This is my

‘“agreement, you shall pay me a hundred pounds.” I presume no one would hesitate to refer the pronoun to the condition proposed.’ (34 23).

33. There can be no objection to the word ‘this’ being taken with the latter part of the sentence. But the interpretation of the word ‘covenant’ involved in this criticism is contrary to all the proofs we have given both negative and positive. He however endeavours to enforce his interpretation by what he considers parallel texts (34 25), and these we shall do well to examine. In these instances, as in the other, we see no objection to the term *this* in each text being referred to the second member of the sentence, but in what way this affects the meaning of the term covenant we have yet to learn.

34. The first text is, “This is my covenant, with them, saith the Lord; my spirit, which is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth,’ &c.’ (Is. lix. 21; 34 25.)

35. As we have seen, certain conditions of the covenant are called by its name, and this is one of the proof texts selected by Gesenius as an illustration of the same. (Sec. 25).

36. The second text quoted is of the same class, ‘And this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel: after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their interior,’ &c. (34 25). This also is one of Gesenius’ proof texts of the renewal and amendment of the covenant already made with Abraham and his posterity, as given under his first-class of meanings to the term covenant. (sec 24.) It describes, in fact, a very favourable change in the conditions of the covenant

37. Dr Wiseman appears to overlook the fact that in all the instances he has referred to, the covenant is one and the same, viz., the one made with Abraham and his posterity, and not many separate and distinct covenants, or leagues. The covenant in relation to Abraham, to Moses, and to Christ, is the same, and not so many distinct covenants, but the same more or less revealed. From the first the covenant was in or through Jesus Christ, and in Him only. It was in Abraham’s seed, not seeds, that he and all nations were blessed.

38. The next text adduced is quite of another class. ‘According to the original, “In this will I make a covenant “with you in boring out your right eyes.”’ (34 25; 1 Sam. xi. 2.) But why does he give this text, as he thinks, according to the original Hebrew? It would not have suited his purpose to quote either from his own English version or ours. The former is—‘On this condition will I make a covenant ‘with you, that I may pluck out all your right eyes.’ The latter is substantially the same. From either or both of these versions it is certain that he could not have ventured to impose upon the reader his supposed sense of the passage, which seems almost incredible, viz., that boring out the right eyes is the covenant proposed to be made. That there may be no mistake respecting it, his own inference shall be given, as stated elsewhere—“what I am going to express is my covenant,” so that they are only an introductory or preliminary ‘formula. Another instance—1 Sam. xi., 2—“In this will “I make my covenant with you in boring out your right “eyes.” Here again the hard covenant follows the introductory phrase.’ *Lectures on the principal doctrines, &c., of the Catholic Church. Vol. II., p. 181.* But he has not given the text quite according to the original, for the term covenant is not found there. The first part literally is—‘In this will ‘I covenant with you, &c.’ The like translation of the same word occurs in 2 Chro. vii. 18, and Hag. ii. 5. That he has entirely misunderstood this passage, and especially the words ‘in this,’ may be demonstrated from other passages where the same original words occur. Two of these passages shall be given translated in his style. ‘Only *in this* [on this condition] will we consent unto you (to give our sister) in your ‘being circumcised.’ (Gen. xxxiv. 15.) Again—‘Only *in this* [on this condition] will the men consent unto us for to ‘dwell with us . . . in our being circumcised.’ (ver. 22)

39. To understand these two passages, which are precisely the same in phraseology and argument, in the manner Dr Wiseman professed to understand the passage in question, would be to make unmitigated nonsense of them. The sons of Jacob feigned to consent to give their sister in marriage to the Shechemites on condition that they be circumcised; and

Nabash consented to covenant with Israel on condition that he thrust out their right eyes.

40. This view of the passages is sustained in modern versions, Roman Catholic not excepted. Geddes, a Roman Catholic, has translated them thus—‘On this condition only ‘can we assent to you that every male of ‘you be circumcised.’ ‘On this condition only will those ‘men consent to dwell with us that every male ‘among us be circumcised.’ ‘On this condition will I make a ‘covenant with you, that I thrust out all your right eyes.’

41. The other texts quoted by Dr Wiseman (34 25) have no relation to the term covenant, and are quite irrelevant; they serve, however, to show us in what sense he understands the term covenant in the text in question, viz., not really as a covenant or league, but as a parallel or analogous term to such words as command, ordinance, statute, and must be interpreted accordingly. This, then, is the interpretation—‘This ‘is my covenant, that is, my command, ordinance, or statute ‘. . . . that every man child among you shall be circum- ‘cised.’ A strange misapplication of texts certainly. As Dr Pusey has adopted this interpretation, further remarks will be reserved until we notice it, as retailed by him, with a few additional texts of the same class.

42. In the meantime it is important to notice that the exposition which Dr Wiseman labours so hard to refute, he calls a Protestant one. So it is, and a very ancient Catholic and also Roman Catholic one too; whereas the one which he gives is neither Protestant nor ancient Catholic, and if Roman Catholic at all, is very young Roman Catholic. Most probably he is himself the author and inventor of it.

43. In the two phrases, then, ‘This is my covenant,’ ‘my ‘covenant shall be in your flesh’ (Gen. xvii. 10-13), the word covenant does not mean ordinance or statute, &c., nor yet literally covenant, but circumcision, the token of the covenant, the token taking the name of that of which it is a token, in accordance with the well-established rule to which we have already alluded.

44. We could not expect the early fathers to favour us with the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures; yet we are so

favoured by one of all others the most able and most likely. Origen quotes the latter text thus—“And shall be,” says God ‘to Abraham, “circumcision even my covenant upon thy ‘flesh’’’ (*et erit circumcisio et testamentum meum super carnem tuam*), plainly interpreting covenant by circumcision. *On Gen. Hom.* iii., *Tom.* viii., *p.* 160. The statements of Chrysostom and Lapidé on this point have been given already. (Sec. 31.) The Roman Catholic commentators, Nicolas De Lyra, Tostatus, and Vatabler, justify the same exposition, especially Vatabler, who, on the former text, says, ‘Here covenant is taken for the symbol or sign of the covenant, viz., ‘for circumcision, as is explained in the verse following, “and “it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and you.”’

45. Dr Pusey reiterates the exposition of Dr Wiseman. He says, ‘It is not said, “Circumcision is my covenant.” . . . ‘God says, “This is my covenant between me and you . . . “every man child among you shall be circumcised.” This ‘*was* His covenant itself, and not any figure of a covenant.’ (35 25.) He does not here intend a contradiction. It is true that he hints that circumcision was not the covenant, and plainly declares that ‘covenant’ means simply covenant, and that circumcision here is not called by the name of that of which it is the token, viz., the covenant God made with Abraham; and yet here he says to be circumcised *was* God’s covenant itself. Here he gives a private unauthorised meaning to the word covenant, viz., statute or ordinance. Substituting the word ordinance for covenant in the text in question, we see plainly what he means: ‘This is my ordinance,’ &c. In fact, this is a very concise abridgment of Dr Wiseman’s more elaborate exposition, which the reader will find (34 23-26) quoted from him, and explained and answered as above (secs. 32-44).

46. The examination of the reasons which Dr Pusey gives for his interpretation will be left for a short time, as in connection with this text he gives the like interpretation of another precisely of the same kind, and defends the exposition of each by one set of texts. The text is, ‘Wherefore the children of ‘Israel shall keep the Sabbath to observe the Sabbath throughout ‘their generations, [for] a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between ‘me and the children of Israel for ever’ (Ex. xxxi. 16, 17).

47. In this text also we maintain that the sign, that is, the Sabbath, takes the name of that of which it is the sign, namely, the covenant, and is not 'really' and 'substantially' the covenant. But Dr Pusey says, 'In like way, Ex. xxxi. 16, it is 'not said that the Sabbath is a covenant: but it *is said* (ver. '17) that it is "a sign"' (35 26).

48. The literal translation of the text is: 'And the sons of 'Israel have kept the Sabbath for to observe the Sabbath, 'throughout their generations; an everlasting covenant between 'me and between the sons of Israel, a sign it for everlasting.' In the Hebrew strong asseverations are expressed by the perfect tense, here meaning that the Israelites shall surely keep the Sabbath. The phrase everlasting covenant is certainly in apposition to the word Sabbath. The Sabbath then is spoken of as an everlasting covenant, and the Sabbath is an everlasting sign. The undoubted meaning is, that the Sabbath is an everlasting sign or condition of the covenant made with Abraham and confirmed by Moses. The Latin Vulgate has translated the text thus: 'Let the children of Israel keep the Sabbath, and 'celebrate it in their generations. It is an everlasting covenant between me and the children of Israel, and a perpetual 'sign.' The Septuagint is: 'It is a perpetual covenant with 'me and the children of Israel, it is a perpetual sign with me.' Here plainly, notwithstanding the assertion of Dr Pusey, the Sabbath is said to be a covenant as much as it is said to be a sign. But, in fact, we know the Sabbath was not a covenant, but a sign or condition of it, and according to the rule we have so frequently noticed, it took the name of it. Geddes, a Roman Catholic author, has so rendered the passage in question: 'It 'is a constant token of the perpetual covenant between me 'and the children of Israel.' Gesenius, as we have seen, explains it under the term covenant, meaning not covenant properly but the sign of it (see 27). In his Hebrew Thesaurus, under the word Sabbath, he says, 'The Sabbath is called a 'certain sign appointed to be kept in memory of the covenant, 'which by God had been made with the Israelitish people.' In Fuerst's Hebrew Lexicon, under the word sign, in his second class of meanings, we have '*covenant-sign*, in full the sign of 'a covenant between God and man in general. or with Israel

‘in particular, for the sake of remembering the covenant; also ‘*sign*’ alone, Gen. ix. 13; xvii. 11; Ex. xxxi. 13; Ezekiel ‘xx. 12. As religion was a covenant to Israel, the separate ‘laws (circumcision, the Sabbath, &c.) were signs of the covenant.’ Lapipe, on the words, as quoted from the Latin, ‘It ‘is an everlasting covenant between me and the children of ‘Israel’ (*pactum est sempiternum inter me et filios Israel*), remarks, ‘The Sabbath he calls a covenant, that is, the condition of the covenant.’ The plain and evident teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures, as recorded by some of the best Hebrew scholars known, as well as held by two very learned Roman Catholic authors, is flatly against the modern private exposition of these two Doctors.

49. But we must not be too hasty, for we have not as yet considered and answered all their reasons. Dr Pusey says, ‘The words, “For an everlasting covenant,” are added as in ‘Gen. xvii. 7; Lev. xxiv. 8, also, or other equivalent words.’ Here he cites seven more texts (35 26). This is a most inaccurate and deceptive statement. It is not to be questioned that the word covenant is generally used without any figure or ellipsis. It is so in Genesis xvii. 7, which Dr Pusey cites, and of this text, and of the seven others, in which, as given in our version, the word statute or ordinance occurs, it truly may be stated as Dr Pusey says, ‘This is said plainly, without any ‘figure’ (35 26). But these last seven texts, and Leviticus xvi. 34, and xvii. 7, of the same kind cited by Dr Wiseman (34 25) are utterly irrelevant, unless it can be proved that such words as statute and ordinance are equivalent, as Dr Pusey says, and Dr Wiseman implies, to covenant, that is *וְכָסֵף* or *וְכִסְיָה*, the two words occurring in the original in the texts in question, are of the same meaning, or analogous to the word *בְּרִית*, which is simply impossible. Can *νόμιμον* have the same meaning as *διαθήκη*, the corresponding renderings of the Septuagint? This also is impossible. It would seem as if these two Doctors were not very scrupulous about the means they use, provided they can gain their ends.

50. Dr Pusey cites Leviticus xxiv. 8 as an instance like Genesis xvii. 7, in which the word covenant means simply

covenant, 'without any figure' (35 26). But we claim this text as an instance in which the word covenant is used elliptically for a sign, condition, or requirement of the covenant, and regard it as confirmatory and illustrative of the universally received interpretation of the texts which we have already considered.

51. It has been shown with what latitude the word covenant is used in the place of its laws, its conditions, its tokens, &c. (secs. 24-29). When the covenant was confirmed by Moses, the blood by which it was confirmed was called 'the blood of the covenant.' But on that occasion additional things were enjoined as conditions and signs of the covenant, and, among other things, the shew-bread to be set before the Lord alway. The text then may be translated or understood as follows : 'He shall set it (the shew-bread) in order before the Lord continually, from the children of Israel a perpetual [sign or condition of the] covenant.'

52. A Lapidé, on the words 'everlasting covenant,' remarks, 'For these loaves are, as it were, a perpetual symbol of the covenant entered into between me and the people, and bear a continual memorial of it.' Under the word 'covenant,' in Smith's Biblical Dictionary, we are told, 'The word covenant came to be applied to a sure ordinance, such as that of the shew-bread' (Lev. xxiv. 8). Our leading Hebrew lexicons, such as Gesenius', Fuerst's, Lee's, and Simon's edited by Winer, give no such meaning to the word covenant.

53. The last instance we shall cite of the use of sacramental language in connection with the term covenant, and which cannot be taken literally, is Lev. ii. 13 : 'And every oblation of thy meat offering thou shalt season with salt; neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat offering.'

54. A Lapidé states, 'It is called the salt of the covenant, that is, the salt of this law by which the salt is commanded to be added in the mincha. For the law was a reason, condition, and bond of the covenant and pledge between God and the Hebrews. Whence the tables of the law were called the tables of the covenant, and often elsewhere the law itself is called the covenant. But the salt is peculiarly said of this law, because it was the salt of the covenant : for

'by salt was signified the firmness of the law and of the covenant, and therefore in all covenants salt was accustomed to be added.' Under the term salt, Fuerst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, explains: 'A symbolical designation of duration and indissolubleness,' and he refers us to Numbers xviii. 19; 2 Chr. xiii. 5. That point may be considered as quite certain. In the last and best edition of Gesenius' Lexicon, under the same word we are told 'the offerings are to be seasoned with salt, because salt is the symbol of the perpetual covenant between God and man.' Oleaster says, 'Salt signifies the covenant, 2 Chr. xiii. 5. Salt represents the incorruptibility and firmness of the covenant.' Mercerus explains salt of the covenant as meaning 'The salt of this law; for the law is often called the covenant.' Tostatus says, 'Respecting this, it is plain in the tables of the law which are called tables of the covenants, because they contained the ten commandments, which were the covenants, and so also this law which God by Himself gave to the Israelites, as well as that which, being renewed by Moses, was given to the people, are called covenants.'

55. All the ancient versions including the Chaldee Targums with one exception, give the same rendering as our version. The exception is the Arabic, 'Thou shalt not withdraw from thine oblation salt, because it is the covenant of thy God.' This rendering makes the text a parallel with the others which we have already considered. In fact, in all these instances, the word covenant is in apposition to the various words which it defines, and it is of little consequence whether we say, 'blood is the covenant,' or 'blood of the covenant.' Dr Pusey, however, says, "'Blood is the covenant" is a mistranslation.' This we deny. In the original, the word covenant is in apposition to the word blood, and defines it, and in English it might be rendered, 'blood of the covenant,' 'covenant blood,' or 'blood is the covenant.' The Hebrew phrase is simple, 'blood covenant,' meaning the blood by which the covenant was ratified or confirmed. Our Lord, it must be admitted, used only one form of words in relation to the cup in instituting His holy Supper, and probably included the very words of Moses, or if Syriac words and not Hebrew, yet in the same order and form. His two servants, Matthew and Mark,

have rendered His words thus, 'Blood of the new covenant.' But His other two servants, Luke and Paul, have rendered the self same words as follows ;—'Cup [meaning wine] is the new 'covenant.' St Luke and St Paul are not to be charged with mistranslating our Lord's words. Doubtless, the two phrases are equivalent. This receives confirmation from the valuable and ancient Syriac version, for where in the Greek we have, 'This cup is the new covenant' (1 Cor. xi. 25), that translation has given, 'This is the cup of the new covenant.' It is of little consequence which form of rendering is adopted, for such phrases. Sometimes it is more convenient to use one rather than the other, and there are instances both in our version and in others in which the sense is given in a way different from both.

56. The following list of phrases taken from the texts which we have already considered with a few additional ones may help the reader unlearned in Hebrew to understand some of its peculiarities. 'Sabbath is the covenant,' or 'Sabbath of the covenant;' 'salt is the covenant,' or 'salt of the 'covenant;' 'shew bread is the covenant,' or 'shew bread of 'the covenant;' 'Blood is the covenant,' or 'blood of the 'covenant;' 'cup is the new covenant' (Luke xxii. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 25). Or 'blood of the new covenant' (Matt. xxvi. 28, Mark xiv. 24). The Peshito Syriac version regards, 'cup of 'the new covenant,' and 'cup is the new covenant,' as equivalent phrases. All these phrases with others, some of which we shall now adduce, in connection with the word covenant, are often elliptical. 'Circumcision is my covenant,' that is the token of it. The Sabbath is not the covenant, but a sign and condition of it; salt is not the covenant, but a symbol of its firmness and durability; the shew bread is not the covenant, but a symbol or memorial of it. 'The words of the 'covenant' (Ex. xxxiv. 28, Jer. xi. 2, 3, 6, 8, xxxiv. 18) that is the words of the law of the covenant. 'Tables of the covenant' (Deut. ix. 9, 11), that is, tables of the law or precepts of the covenant. 'Ark of the covenant' (Josh. iii. 14) that is, the ark of the law of the covenant. 'This is my 'covenant' (Isa. lix. 21), that is the promise or conditions of my covenant, 'the men of the land that is in league,' lite-

rally, 'The sons of the land of the covenant' (Ezek. xxx. 5). That is, the land promised in the covenant, viz., the promised land, 'Angel of the covenant' (Mal. iii. 1), that is, probably the angel or messenger promised in the covenant as made with Abraham, and frequently foretold in many parts of Scripture.

57. We come now to the phrases which we desire more especially to consider, and for which these others have been adduced as illustrations. They are as follow, 'Behold,' or 'This is the blood of the covenant.' (Ex. xxiv. 8, Heb. ix. 20). 'Blood of the new covenant.' (Matt. xxvi. 28, Mark xiv. 24). 'Cup is the new covenant.' (Luke xxii. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 25). In these instances we shall give the ellipses as supplied by ancient and modern authors, beginning with Tertullian. On Luke xxii. 20, he says, 'In the mention of the cup, He, when 'establishing the Testament *sealed* with His blood. (10 13). In reference to the same text, Origen remarks, 'Therefore the 'covenant of God *is constituted* with regard to us in the blood 'of Christ's passion.' (11 14.) Theodoret on Heb. ix. 20, states, 'By His own blood *confirmed* the new covenant.' (Tom. iii. p. 602.) Sedulius on the words, 'In my blood.' (1 Cor. xi. 25.) remarks, 'The old and new covenants *were dedicated* by blood.' (Bib. Mag. Vet. Patr. Tom. v. pt. i. p. 487.) Theophylact on Luke xxii. 20, states, 'That which he 'names of the new covenant [This cup is the new covenant], 'and says that this *was sanctioned* in His own blood. For in 'the old there was the blood of animals when the law was given; but now when the Word of God was made man, blood '*seals* the new covenant to us.' (Comment. in Lucam., p. 514.) The same passage as quoted by Aquinas in his *Catena Aurea* is as follows—'Our Lord calls the cup the new covenant, as it follows, "This is the new covenant in my blood, " "which shall be shed for you," signifying that the new covenant *has its beginning* in His blood. For in the old covenant, the blood of animals was present when the law was given, but now the blood of the Word of God *signifies* (*significat*) to us the new covenant.' How Aquinas himself and Nicolas de Lyra supply the ellipses may be seen above. (Secs. 14-16.)

58. Vatabler, a Roman Catholic, on the words, 'blood of

'the new covenant,' (Matt. xxvi. 28) states, 'which appertains to the *confirmation* of the new covenant in which remission of sins is given to believers.' (*Critici Sacri*, Tom. vi. pt. i. p. 869.)

59. Erasmus on the words, 'In my blood' (Luke xxii. 20), remarks, '*In* appears to be placed for *through*, as the old covenant was confirmed and dedicated by the people being sprinkled with the blood of cattle, so Christ by His own blood *dedicated* the new covenant; which he clearly explains 'who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews.' (*Ibid.* Tom. vi. pt. ii. p. 719.)

60. Dathe, in his critical Latin translation of the Old Testament, renders Ex. xxiv. 8 as follows:—'This is the blood by the shedding of which, the covenant *is sanctioned*.'

61. Rosenmüller in his Scholia on Luke xxii. 20. 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood,' says, 'A brief locution; for the cup is used for that which is contained in the cup, and the wine by metonymia is called the covenant itself, when it is merely made the symbol of the covenant. The sense is, in the institution of this sacred rite, I at the same time institute a new form of religion which *is now sanctioned* in my blood, that is by my death.'

62. Kuinoel on the words, 'Blood of the new covenant,' (Matt. xxvi. 28) remarks, 'which, namely, the blood, belongs to the new covenant, by which blood the new covenant, the new religion, *is solemnly sanctioned* and *established*; the same sense is given in Luke xxii. 20, "This cup is the "new covenant in my blood," that is, the new covenant, which by my blood *is sanctioned*.' Gesenius on Matt. xxvi. 28, says, 'The blood of Jesus Christ, by which the new covenant *is confirmed*.' (See above, sec. 24.) For the sentiments of A Lapide, see secs. 66, 68, 69, below.

63. It has been demonstrated then, how very uncatholic and unscriptural these two Doctors, Wiseman and Pusey, are in their interpretation of the various texts used in connection with the word covenant and defined thereby.

64. The reader cannot fail to see the perfect identity of the language of our blessed Lord in the words of institution in relation to the covenant with that of the Hebrew Scriptures.

We have no means of knowing the exact form of words used by our Lord in the language in which He spoke on the occasion. Two accounts render His words one way, and two another, but both, as we have seen, are exactly equivalent in meaning. It should be specially noticed, that the interpretation of this portion of the sacramental language of Scripture is neither private nor new. It is maintained alike by the early Fathers, the most famous Roman Catholic doctors, although zealous believers in the doctrine of the Real Presence in the elements, and by the most advanced Hebrew scholars of modern times. No men boast more of their observance of the rule of the monk of Lerins than do Romanists and Romanizers, yet no men, when it suits their purpose, can more distinctly violate it. Vincent says we are to hold, '*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*' Our interpretation 'has been believed everywhere, always, and 'by all men.' Whereas that of Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey has *nowhere, never, and by nobody* been believed, save and except by themselves; when Dr Wiseman did, 'On the assumption of our Lady, 1836,' set forth and have printed and published a book entitled 'The Real Presence,' &c., containing the said misinterpretation; and Dr Pusey, 'in Notes on a 'Sermon, preached A.D. 1853,' gave currency to the same misinterpretation. The same thing hath also been believed by their devoted and humble and simple followers.

65. Perhaps it may be said that these learned doctors never maintained that the cup was really and substantially the covenant. But they have, as we have seen, affirmed, that they take our Lord's words literally, and they both maintain that 'Holy Scripture itself determines that there is a figure where 'there is one.' (34 7, 35 14, 24.) But Holy Scripture has not determined that there is a figure here either in the text or context. They must, by their own rules, take it literally. But if, disregarding their own strong assertions, and violating their own rules, they do take it figuratively, then one half of the whole language of institution respecting the cup they take figuratively, and the other half they take literally. What St Luke and St Paul say respecting the cup, they take figuratively, but what St Matthew and St Mark have stated, they take,

literally, and so make these holy men contradict one another, which we are certain is not the case, as we have already explained. This is one of the many difficult points with which believers in the doctrine of the Real Presence have to contend, and it is interesting to notice how a learned and able man, such as A. Lapipe was, endeavours to surmount the insuperable difficulties. We shall give his statements and then examine them.

66. On Matt. xxvi. 28, he remarks,

‘Observe Matthew and Mark have, “For this is my blood of the “New Testament ;” but Luke and Paul, “This cup is the New “Testament in my blood ;” but the sense of each phrase is the same. Yet Christ rather seems to have spoken in that manner as Matthew and Mark narrate, for that phrase is clearer. See 1 Cor. xi. 25, ‘Christ, by instituting the Eucharist in the last supper, rather than ‘on the cross, *established* and *sanctioned* His testament and covenant ‘(*fœdus*) with the Church. For here were present all the apostles ‘who bore and represented the person of the Church.’

Again,

67. ‘Luke has expressly, “This cup is the New Testament in my “blood, which, namely, the cup, “shall be shed for you.” For the ‘article ought to be referred to the cup, not to the blood, but to the ‘nominative, since the blood is the dative case. Therefore the cup, or ‘the cup of the blood of Christ was shed for us, and the cup of the ‘blood was shed in the Eucharist, not on the cross (for no cup was ‘there); therefore the shedding of blood is an offering and sacrifice.”

68. On 1 Cor. xi. 24, he remarks, ‘Not only Paul, but all ‘the others, namely, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, narrate the ‘Supper and the history, in the same manner, and with the ‘same words, “This is my body,” “This is my blood,” and ‘the Syriac translator most expressly אִתּוֹהִי פָנִי [Is my body] ‘that is, my body itself.’ (Mark xiv. 22.)

69. Again, on the 25th verse, ‘This cup is the New Testament in my blood,’ he remarks. ‘This cup is the original ‘instrument and paper (*charta*), as it were, on which is written ‘and sealed the New Testament—that is, the new covenant ‘(*fœdus*) was *sanctioned*, and the new divine promise, and my ‘last will, were sealed respecting the eternal inheritance given ‘to you, if you believe and obey me; it is written, I say, not ‘with letters of ink, but in my blood, which this cup contains, ‘as a paper contains the writing of a Testament.’

70. 'You say Matthew and Mark have "This is the blood of the "New Testament;" how then does Paul say, "This cup," that is the 'blood contained in the cup, "is the Testament." I answer, "Testament" is taken doubly. First, for the last will of a testator—so 'Matthew and Mark call it "the blood of the Testament," that is, the 'blood by which the last will of Christ *was confirmed*. Secondly, '“Testament” signifies a writing, or the instrument of this last will, 'so Paul takes it here, and therefore calls the blood itself the “Testament.” Observe, Christ here alludes to the covenant (*fœdus*) of 'Moses between God and the people, ratified by the blood of victims (Ex. xxiv.), which figuratively signified this covenant (*fœdus*), *ratified* 'by the blood of Christ.'

71. This, perhaps, may be considered one of the ablest and best attempts at reconciling the words of institution in relation to the cup with the doctrine of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements. But could anything be more inharmonious and contradictory? He says the sense of each phrase is the same. (66). So it is as we have shown above (secs. 11, 12, 55). But he gives several contradictory senses. He affirms that in all four accounts it is said, 'This is my blood.' (68), whereas in truth it is only so said in two accounts, and in the other two it is as distinctly said, 'This is the New Testament.' He admits this, giving the very words. (70). Here then are two different senses. He has given us a remarkable instance in which the ancient Peshito Syriac version has used a word which seems to favour his opinion in one case out of the four with regard to the words of institution respecting the bread, viz., 'This is my body' (sec. 68.); the very emphatic substantive verb being used. It is only used once more in the words of institution, but once too often for A Lapide, for it is used in the same connection with the word covenant as it is above with the word body—thus, 'This cup is (אִיתוּחִי) the 'new covenant in my blood' (1 Cor. xi. 25). But, as we have seen, he does not consider the cup to be substantially, but only 'as it were' the covenant. The two phrases cannot be taken diversely, the one literally and the other figuratively, and the latter is the only consistent alternative. His criticism on Luke xxii. 20, as given above (67) is plausible but out of place. The mere English reader will best understand it by giving its result in a translation of the passage. 'The blood, in this cup, is the New Testament in my blood,

‘which (blood in the cup) is shed for you.’ The phrase ‘is shed,’ no doubt refers to the word blood as it does in the statement of the same thing as given by St Matthew and St Mark, and not to the cup or its contents. That Basil so understood the words is certain, from the fact that he has given the phrase in such a way as to convey no other meaning, which is *διαθήκη σι* *ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου τῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐνυχομένῳ*. (‘This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which (blood) is shed for you.’) (*Moral. Reg.* xxi. c. iii., *Tom.* ii. p. 432.)

72. It should be observed that in this account given by St Luke and St Paul, it is not said, ‘This cup is my blood,’ but ‘This cup is the new covenant in my blood.’ Is it conceivable that either of these men, by that statement, meant to teach that the contents of the cup was blood and not wine? According to A Lapide, the contents of the cup are blood and not wine. So that St Luke and St Paul make our Lord to say, ‘This blood is the new covenant in my blood.’ We naturally ask, what is there that is sacramental in such language? There is the thing signified, but where is that which signifies, or the sign? The sign unquestionably is wine, and the thing signified is blood, but blood inseparably connected with the confirmation of the covenant. In this view of the case, it is of little consequence whether we say, ‘This wine is [a memorial of] my blood [by which is confirmed], the new covenant;’ or, ‘This wine is [a memorial of] the new covenant [confirmed] in my blood.’

73. He considers that Matthew and Mark understood the word Testament in one sense, and Luke and Paul in another sense. (70). But the Syriac version to which A Lapide has appealed, regards the phrases ‘Blood of the new covenant,’ ‘This cup is the new covenant,’ as being exactly the same in sense, and in Luke the latter phrase is translated thus—‘This is the cup of the new covenant in my blood’ (xxii. 20.) It is certain that Origen took exactly the same view of the case, for he says, ‘As it is written in the gospel, “The cup of the “new covenant””’ (*ποτήριον καινῆς διαθήκης*) *In Matt. Tom.* xvii. 33, *Tom.* iv. p. 161.

74. Contrary to his own rules, he has given a figurative interpretation to a part of the words of institution, understand-

ing the phrase 'This cup is the New Testament,' not to mean that the cup or what it contains is really and substantially the New Testament, but 'as it were' the Testament. (69). He also directs our thoughts from the actual bloodshedding as suffered by our Saviour on the cross, and substitutes an actual bloodshedding in relation to the cup. (66, 67). By understanding the word 'covenant' in several senses, he has different meanings at hand to suit his purpose. We know, as we have explained, that it has but one meaning. The maintainers of the doctrine we are opposing say as little as possible upon that part of the words of institution which we have now considered, and if they can say nothing better than what A Lapide has said their reticence is based on prudence.

75. We come now to consider a portion of the sacramental phraseology of the New Testament, confirmatory and illustrative of the figurative interpretation of the words of institution in the Lord's Supper, and in which the signs, or significant acts, are not really and substantially the things which they signify.

76. Three instances only will be given. 'Know ye not, 'that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were 'baptised into his death! Therefore we are buried with Him 'by baptism into death' (Rom. vi. 3, 4). 'Buried with Him 'in baptism' (Col. ii. 12). 'By the washing (laver) of regeneration' (Titus iii. 5). It is maintained in the two first passages that baptism is not burial with Christ, but a sign of it; and in the third text, that washing or laver is not regeneration but a sign of it. Dr Pusey, in answer to this kind of interpretation, remarks, 'But according to the faith which came from 'the apostles, baptism is called "the washing of regeneration," 'not as being a bare sign of it, but as the sacrament, whereby 'Almighty God is pleased to work it, nor according to the 'same faith is baptism any mere sign of burial with Christ, 'but God's appointed means, whereby He conveys to the soul 'the inward spiritual grace' (35 30).

77. It is our duty to protest against Dr Pusey's representing us when we speak of signs which we believe to be of divine appointment as regarding them as *bare* signs, *mere* signs, &c. We do not believe any signs or sacraments in Holy Scripture

really and substantially to be, or contain in themselves, the things of which they are the signs or sacraments ; but surely on that account we are not to be charged with believing them to be *bare* or *mere* signs or sacraments, as if indeed they were without design, meaning, end, or purpose, and began and ended with themselves and existed for their own sake. This is the way in which Romanists slandered our Reformers, and represented them, with the exception of Luther and one or two of his followers, as regarding the sacramental signs as mere signs, bare signs, &c.

78. But supposing we admit that baptism, as Dr Pusey contends, is God's appointed means of conveying spiritual burial with Christ, and His chosen instrument of effecting spiritual regeneration in us ; the phrases are still figurative and not literal, and equally serve to illustrate the like style of speech in the institution of the Lord's Supper. Baptism is not burial with Christ ; baptism is not regeneration, though it be admitted to be the appointed means of conveying each blessing. Augustine adduced one of these texts to prove that sacraments are called by the names of those things which they signify and are not literally what they are called. (21, 3).

79. But we maintain that baptism was appointed by Christ not as the means of spiritual burial with Christ, or as the instrument of spiritual regeneration, but as a sign or seal of the same, and that baptism in such cases is called by that which it signifies, or that of which it is a sign. Augustine, with other fathers, calls circumcision a sign of regeneration, and they commonly regard baptism as being in the Christian dispensation what circumcision was in the Jewish. Origen on Rom. ii. 28, 29, draws a parallel between the two thus. ' Since we may say that catechumens (unbaptised persons) are ' yet in uncircumcision, and that the faithful are circumcised ' by the grace of baptism. If therefore a catechumen who ' is not circumcised by the grace of the laver,' &c. (*Opera, Tom. vi. p. 120*).

80. We maintain that baptism is not spiritual regeneration, nor is it the appointed means of effecting it. In our answer to Dr Pusey's challenge, we think it desirable that no part of the plain sacramental language of Scripture should be passed

over, least of all that relating to the ordinance of baptism. We believe that one common principle of interpretation applies to the language of both rites. Divines and biblical scholars, however, who repudiate Dr Pusey's interpretation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper give the same kind of interpretation to the sacrament of baptism. The interpretation Dean Alford gives of the text in question (Titus iii. 5) is a case in point. He says, 'The font is the "laver of regeneration," because it is the vessel consecrated to the use of that sacrament whereby, in its *completeness* as a sacrament, the new life unto God is conveyed. And inasmuch as it is in that font, and when we are in it, that the first breath of that life is drawn, it is the laver *of*—belonging to, setting forth—regeneration. Observe, there is here no figure—the words are literal. Baptism is taken in all its completion—the outward visible sign accompanied by the inward spiritual grace; and as thus *complete*, it not only represents but *is* the new birth.'

81. Here, in a marvellous manner, the Dean confounds that in the sacrament which represents with that which is represented—the symbol with the substance. We are told 'it [baptism 'in all its completion'] not only *represents*.' In truth the outward visible sign—the symbol—the water—only represents. Nor is baptism in all its completion the new birth, but the inward spiritual grace or substance only.

82. The Dean's belief of the sacrament of baptism is exactly like Dr Pusey's belief of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and is stated in his words. We have only to substitute one sacrament for the other, and we have Dr Pusey's exact doctrine as follows;—"This is my body;" "This is my blood." 'Observe, there is here no figure; the words are literal; the sacrament of the body and blood is taken in all its completion, the outward visible signs accompanied by the things signified; and as thus *complete*, they not only represent but *are* the body and blood.'

83. As far as we have gone, we have found no evidence whatever to show that signs or symbols, are also the substance of which they are the signs or symbols, or the means of conveying it. Is the sacrament of baptism an exception? This is a point we have now to examine. Owing to the various

senses in which the word regeneration has been understood, it will be necessary to consider baptism in relation to the word regeneration as understood by both parties. And here we shall have to adduce additional alleged evidence in proof that baptism is the divinely appointed instrument of regeneration in order that we may have a definite case before us.

84. Dean Hook in his *Church Dictionary*, under the article *Regeneration*, states. 'To many persons this doctrine [baptismal regeneration] is very offensive. We believe that it is repudiated by all dissenters except the Romish, who, amidst their many errors, retain this evangelical truth.' In a preceding article, he says, 'By the pardon of our sins, we are begotten again to a lively hope; and herein stands the first particular of our regeneration, namely, in the remission of sins; wherefore both Scripture and antiquity teach us (Luke iii. 3; Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16) that baptism is the means for remission of sin; and hence they join pardon and remission commonly together.' Under the word *Regeneration*, he adds two more texts in proof of his doctrine of baptismal regeneration. (1 Peter iii. 21, and 2 Peter i. 9.)

85. From this we learn that in the opinion of Dean Hook, remission of sins is a part of regeneration. But remission of sins, or exemption from condemnation, is justification. Are we to understand then, that baptism is the appointed means of our pardon or justification before God? In one of 'the *Tracts for the Times*,' it is stated. 'Indeed, this may even be set down as the essence of sectarian doctrine, to consider faith, and not the sacraments as the instrument of justification.' In answer to this, we adduce the case of Abraham, and inquire whether he was regenerated by the sacrament of circumcision, or justified by that ordinance? We have already seen that circumcision was the token of the covenant which God made with Abraham, and in which he lived in a state of acceptance with God on whom he believed; and respecting his justification, this did not take place 'in circumcision, but in uncircumcision; and he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised.' (Rom. iv. 10, 11.)

86. And from this we infer what Augustine did, viz., that

the sacrament of baptism stands in the same relation to the new covenant as the sacrament of circumcision did to the old covenant, and with him we say,

‘As Abraham then was justified before he was circumcised; so Cornelius was enriched with the gift of the Holy Ghost before he was baptized. . . . As, then, in Abraham, the righteousness of faith preceded, and circumcision was subsequently added as the seal of the righteousness of faith; so, in Cornelius, spiritual sanctification, in his house, by the Holy Ghost, preceded; and the sacrament of regeneration was subsequently added, in the washing of baptism. . . . The sacrament of baptism is one thing, and conversion of the heart, another thing. . . . Accordingly outward baptism may be administered, where inward conversion of the heart is wanting: and, on the other hand, inward conversion of the heart may exist, where outward baptism has never been received.’ (*De Bap. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24, 25. Opera, Tom. vii. p. 57.*)

87. Jewel, one of our most able divines of the sixteenth century says, ‘now is the sign of the covenant changed, and baptism is instead of circumcision; as St Paul declareth, “Also ye are circumcised with circumcision made without hands, by putting off the sinful body of the flesh, through the circumcision of Christ, in that you are buried with Him through baptism.”’ (Col. ii. 11, 12.) *Treatise of the Sacraments. Works*, vol. i. p. 1105. A true son of Abraham in the Christian dispensation is justified not by baptism, but before baptism; and he receives the sign of baptism, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being unbaptized.

88. But the question may be asked, how stands the case in regard to infants under the new covenant who are not supposed to be capable of faith or repentance? Nowell in his Catechism, which received the sanction of both houses of Convocation, states,

‘That faith and repentance go before baptism, is required only in persons so grown in years, that by age they are capable of both. For as Moses and all the prophets do testify that circumcision was a sign of repentance, so doth St Paul teach that it was a sacrament of faith. Yet the Jews’ children being not yet by age capable of faith and repentance, were nevertheless circumcised; by which visible sign God showed Himself in the Old Testament to be the Father of young children and of the seed of His people. Now sith it is certain that the grace of God is both more plentifully poured, and more clearly

'declared in the gospel by Christ, than at the time it was in the Old Testament by Moses, it were a great indignity if the same grace should now be thought to be either obscurer, or in any part abated. (Acts ii. 17, 18, and x. 45 ; 2 Cor. iii. 6-9, &c. ; Gal. iii. 23, 24 ; Titus, iii. 5, 6.) It is certain that our infants have the force, and, as it were, the substance of baptism common with us, they should have wrong done them if the sign which is inferior to the truth itself, should be denied them. The Lord Christ calleth infants unto Him, and commandeth that no man forbid them to come, embraceth them when they come to Him, and testifieth that to them the kingdom of heaven belongeth (Matt. xviii. 3, 4, 10, and xix. 14 ; Mark x. 13-15), whom God vouchsafeth to be in the heavenly palace, it seemeth a great wrong that men should forbid them the first entry and door thereof, and after a manner to shut them out of the Christian commonweal.' (Pp. 209, 210.)

89. We maintain that baptism, whether in relation to adults or infants, is no more the instrument of regeneration, or the means of justification before God than circumcision was. But Dean Hook, as we have seen above, expressly declares 'that baptism is the means for remission of sin,' and that that is 'the first particular of regeneration.' The texts on which he rests his belief we shall show give no proof of the doctrine. As much depends upon the force of the prepositions in the texts to be quoted, they will be given in the original, with their equivalents as translated in the ancient Syriac version. The first text the Dean quotes is, 'Preaching the baptism of repentance *for* (*ܐܝܢ ܕܝܢܐ*) the remission of sins' (Luke iii. 3.) But we are taught that repentance is *for*, or in order to, remission and not baptism. John's baptism was not *for* remission of sins but *for* repentance. 'I indeed baptize you with water *unto* (*ܐܝܢ ܕܝܢܐ*) *for* repentance' (Matt. iii. 11.) The phrase 'baptism of repentance for remission of sins,' in its first part, is explained then as baptism for repentance, but repentance is for remission. After Christian baptism was instituted the baptism of John was spoken of simply as the 'baptism of repentance' (Acts xiii. 24.) John's baptism was not even the sign or symbol of regeneration, consequently those who had only received that baptism were in some instances at least baptized 'into (*ܐܝܢ ܕܝܢܐ*) the name of the Lord Jesus' (Acts xix. 3-5.)

90. In the New Testament faith and repentance are required

for remission of sins, and not Christian baptism. Thus we have ‘Repent . . . *for* ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \hookrightarrow) the remission of sins’ (Acts ii. 38.) ‘Repentance *unto* (*for* $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \hookrightarrow) life’ (xi. 18.) ‘Repentance *to* (*for* $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \hookrightarrow *for* life) salvation’ (2 Cor. vii. 10.) ‘To them which should hereafter believe on Him *to* (*for* $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \hookrightarrow *for*) life’ (1 Tim. i. 16.) ‘Of them that believe *to* (of faith *for* $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) the saving of the soul’ (Heb. x. 39.) ‘Through faith *unto* (*for* $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \hookrightarrow *for* life) salvation’ (1 Peter i. 5.) In all these instances the Syriac version uses the preposition *for* as denoting purpose. But Christian baptism is uniformly connected with prepositions which denote, in that connection, a state or condition into which the baptized person comes, and never with any preposition in that connection that denotes purpose. Thus, ‘Baptizing them *in* ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \beth) the name’ (Matt. xxviii. 19.) ‘Baptized *in* ($\epsilon\iota\pi\iota$ \beth) the name of Jesus Christ’ (Acts ii. 38.) ‘Baptized *in* ($\epsilon\nu$ \beth) the name of the Lord Jesus’ (Acts x. 48.) ‘Were baptized *in* ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \beth) the name of the Lord Jesus’ (Acts xix. 5.) ‘Were baptized *into* ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \beth) Jesus Christ, were baptized *into* ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \beth) his death’ (Rom. vi. 3.) ‘Baptized *into* ($\epsilon\nu$) one body’ (1 Cor. xii. 13.) ‘Have been baptized *into* ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ \beth) Christ’ (Gal. iii. 27.)

91. There is one text, however, which is generally admitted to teach that baptism in some sense or other is *for* the remission of sins, and as quoted, or rather garbled, by Dean Hook in his Church Dictionary, nothing could be more to the point. ‘Repent, and be baptized every one of you [*in* the name of Jesus Christ] *for the remission of sins*’ (Acts ii. 38.) The Dean, by omitting the phrase which we have bracketed and by the use of emphatic type, makes the text teach his doctrine. But if baptism must be understood here as being *for* the remission of sins, then an office is assigned to it which is most contrary to the analogy of Scripture. Elsewhere St Peter says, ‘Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out’ (Acts iii. 19.) According to his teaching and that of the Scripture generally, we should be compelled to conclude that St Peter connected the remission of sins with repentance, and baptism only with the name of Christ. But if twenty texts uniformly teach one and the same thing, viz., that repentance is *for* the remission of sins, and baptism is

into a state or condition, and a single text teaches that baptism is *for* the remission of sins, we have no right to pervert that single text to bring it into harmony with the twenty. It can be shown, however, from the wording of the text, from other texts where exactly the same style is used, that there need be no necessary connection between baptism and the remission of sins. The text is in fact a well known figure of speech, and admits of simple illustration from other texts where exactly the same figure occurs.

1. 'Repent,
2. 'And be baptized every one of you,
3. 'In the name of Jesus Christ,
4. 'For the remission of sins.' (Acts ii. 38.)

The first line relates to the fourth, and to that only. The exact teaching of St Peter will be ascertained if the lines are read thus, 'Repent, every one of you for the remission of sins, 'and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.' This is confirmed and illustrated by other texts.

1. 'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs,
2. 'Neither cast ye your pearls before swine,
3. 'Lest they trample them under their feet,
4. 'And turn again and rend you.' (Matt. vii. 6.)

If in this instance we take the second line, as connected with the fourth, as in the way the text we are investigating is often taken, then the swine are represented as doing that which is attributed to the dogs, and the dogs are said to do nothing, for manifestly the third line is connected with the second. Let these lines be transposed after the manner of the former text and the undoubted meaning is obtained. 'Give not that 'which is holy unto the dogs, [lest] they turn again and rend 'you, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample 'them under their feet.'

1. 'Hearing of thy love
2. 'And faith,
3. 'Which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus,
4. 'And toward all saints' (Phile. 5.)

If this text is interpreted as Acts ii. 38 is interpreted by the Dean, the fourth line as relating to the second, then we are taught to have faith toward all saints. It is needless to state

that this would be a mistake. Let the lines be transposed as in the other instances, and the unquestionable meaning is, 'Hearing of thy love toward all saints, and faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus.'

1. 'The blind,
2. 'And dumb,
3. 'Both spake
4. 'And saw.' (Matt. xii. 22.)

To interpret this text as the Dean does the text under consideration, viz., connect the second line with the fourth, would be to throw all into confusion; the dumb would be said to see, and the blind to speak, as if sight had been given to the organs of hearing, and speech to the organs of sight. The text so transposed as more directly to express its evident meaning is, 'The blind saw and the dumb spake.'

92. In these texts, and especially in this last one, we are compelled to interpret them in one way; for instance, sight in this last one has reference to blindness, and the power of speech to dumbness, and so in the text under consideration, repentance is connected with remission, and with that only; and baptism is connected with the name of Christ and that only. There is the connection of sequence between the two propositions, as repentance for remission of sins according to divine appointment was to be followed by baptism into the name of Christ, and was a sign or seal of remission.

93. But this naturally brings us to another text quoted by Dean Hook to establish or prove his point, 'Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.' (Acts xxii. 16.) Surely this is an unfortunate text to serve the purpose for which it is quoted. St Paul affirms of himself, 'An apostle, not of men neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.' (Gal. i. 1.) Again he asks, 'Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?' (1 Cor. ix. 1.) Let it be borne in mind that St Paul's baptism was subsequent to his receiving the apostleship. He had acknowledged Christ in His divine character, had believed in Him, had prayed to Him, and was now invested with the holy apostleship. Can it be believed that this humble but most illustrious apostle was unregenerate, unpardoned, unsaved, when Ananias encouraged

him to be baptized and wash away his sins. A Lapide cannot believe it, for in his commentary on the words, he remarks, 'For although it appears that Paul, wholly surrendering himself to God had washed away his sins by the act of contrition and was justified, yet that act included the purpose of baptism.' A Lapide fairly admits that St Paul's sins were washed away, and that he was justified before he was baptized. His odd remark respecting baptism may be accounted for on the ground that he had to square all his interpretations with the Council of Trent.

94. We are sure St Paul was the subject 'of regeneration' or 'new birth,' he only wanted its 'sign.' He was really washed from his sins, he only required the 'water to the *mystical* washing away of sin.' He needed only 'the outward and visible sign of the inward spiritual grace' which he already possessed. He was 'born of the spirit,' it only remained for him to be 'born of water.'

95. It is the common style of Holy Scripture to speak of that which is the sign or token of cleansing or remission as if it were the thing itself or the instrumental cause of it. Hence the Jewish priest is said to cleanse the leper with hyssop, whereas we know in fact that he did not actually cleanse him, but after ascertaining to the best of his judgment that he was clean, he administered the outward token of the same, and was said to cleanse the leper. David regarding himself in the light of a spiritual leper, prayed, 'Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean.' He here uses the sacramental language in the general style of Holy Scripture, yet prays for that inward purity which none but God could give, and of which the cleansing with hyssop would be the outward token and the ratification of his spiritual cleansing.

96. Circumcision itself was not purification or the instrument of effecting it; when rightly used it was the token of it; and by a figure of speech in Scripture it is spoken of as effecting that of which it was a sign, and hence we read of the heart, that is, the will, judgment, and affections being circumcised (Deut. x. 16, and xxx. 6; Acts vii. 51; Rom. ii. 29), and like sacramental phraseology. (Jer. iv. 4.) Baptism, or the sacramental use of water is spoken of in the same style,

‘Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.’ (Heb. x. 22.) St Paul pressed the importance of distinguishing between the symbol and the substance, in the sacrament of circumcision (Rom. ii. 28, 29), and St Peter did the same in the sacrament of baptism, and this brings us to another of Dean Hook’s proof texts, which as quoted by him is, ‘Baptism doth now save us.’ (1 Peter iii. 21.)

97. This is a very unfair way of quoting Scripture. Had the Dean accompanied the short extract with a negative thus, ‘Baptism doth *not*,’ &c., he would have given the extract more in accordance with the context, which shall now be given. ‘Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.’ Leaving out the parenthesis, St Peter connects baptism with the resurrection of Jesus Christ as St Paul does in the two passages (Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12) which we have yet to consider. The parenthesis shows what St Peter means by baptism, and what he does not mean. He tells us the symbol, the outward washing doth not save, but the substance, the thing signified doth save, it is not so much having ‘our bodies washed with pure water,’ as ‘having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.’ This text, like the others, is not in favour of, but very much against the doctrine of the Dean and his friends. Augustine has well remarked respecting some who had only the form of baptism.

“‘Having the form (*formam*) of godliness, but denying the power “thereof.” But the power of godliness is the end of the commandment, that is, “charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, “and of faith unfeigned.” Whence the apostle Peter, when he spoke “of the sacrament of the ark, in which the house of Noah was saved from the flood, said, “So in like form (*forma*) hath baptism saved “you.” And lest they should think that the visible sacrament was sufficient for them, by which they had the form (*formam*) of godliness “and through their evil manners by living wickedly, should deny its power, he immediately added, “not the putting away the filth of the “flesh, but the answer of a good conscience.”’—*Con. Faust.* lib. xix. c. xii. tom. vi. p. 145.

98. We come now to the last text quoted, ‘He hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins’ (2 Peter i. 9).

It is a mere assumption to suppose that the purification here alluded to was effected by baptism. This text does not say so, nor have we any evidence in Holy Scripture for such a doctrine. Perhaps it may be said that it is inward baptism that purges from sin—the substance, and not the symbol. Very true. But it has yet to be proved that outward baptism is the instrument of effecting the inward, that the symbol is the appointed means of conveying the substance.

99. Dean Nowell asks in his Catechism, ‘Do we not then obtain forgiveness of sins by the outward washing or sprinkling of water?’ and answers, ‘No; for only Christ hath with His blood washed and clean washed away the spots of our souls. This honour, therefore, it is not lawful to give to the outward element. But the Holy Ghost, as it were, sprinkling our consciences with that holy blood, wiping away all the spots of sin, making us clean before God. Of this cleansing of our sins we have a seal and pledge in the sacrament,’ p. 208.

100. In the text under consideration the word *purged* or *cleansed* would seem to refer to the substance of baptism rather than to the symbol, to the cleansing by the blood of Christ rather than to the water of baptism; for so the word is used in the epistle to the Hebrews, ‘When He had by Himself *purged* our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high,’ (i. 3).

101. If the untheological reader is astonished that the Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration should be accepted on such insufficient grounds, and concludes that there must be some better evidence for it, we assure him no better has yet been adduced.

102. It remains now for us to show the relation in which the symbol of baptism stands to its substance, the use of the water in that rite to that which it signifies or represents, and the two texts which we have yet to consider in relation to our main argument are admirably suited to our purpose. ‘Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death.’ (Rom. vi. 3, 4). ‘Buried with Him in baptism.’ (Col. ii. 12). It is main-

tained that baptism here is not burial with Christ, but signifies or represents it, or is a type or symbol of it. To this Dr Pusey answers: 'Nor according to the same faith is baptism any mere sign of burial with Christ, but God's appointed means, whereby He conveys to the soul the inward spiritual grace, "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," "as the death of Christ in the flesh was real, so is one's to sin real," says S. Chrysostom.' (35 30).

103. Supposing this statement was according to the faith of the gospel it in no way affects our argument. We quite agree with Chrysostom that death to sin as referred to by the apostle is real, it is not a figurative or symbolical expression, but denotes a real state of mind. This in no way affects our argument, but Chrysostom has said what not only affects but confirms our argument. After the giving of the Holy Ghost in the case of Cornelius (Acts x.) it was asked, 'What then is the use of water? . . . I will mention to you one out of many. What is this one? In it are completed (τελεῖται) the divine symbols, burial and death, resurrection and life. . . . To show that what we say is no conjecture, hear Paul saying, "We are buried with him by baptism into death;" and again, "Our old man is crucified with Him;" and again, "We have been planted together in the likeness of his death."' (*In Joan. Hom. xxv., tom. viii., p. 129*).

104. Aquinas in the twelfth century quoted the same passage in a condensed form, thus: 'But what need is there of water to those who receive the Holy Ghost? It carries out the divine symbols of burial, mortification, resurrection, and life.' (*In Joan., iii. 4-8, Catena Aurea*).

105. On the first text Theodoret states, 'The mystery of baptism itself teacheth thee to flee sin; for baptism bears a type of the Lord's death.' (*Epist. ad Rom., tom. iii., p. 61*). Dr Pusey, in relation to this point, says, 'By making us, through the sacrament of baptism, members of His Son; by giving us, through the Holy Eucharist, the flesh and blood of the incarnate Son, whereby He dwelleth in us, and we in Him. Through these He imparteth to us the life which He Himself is.' (35 6). Dr Pusey here admits that persons

before coming to the Lord's Supper are 'members of His 'Son,' and of course living members; but whence have they derived their life but by a participation of 'the flesh and 'blood of the incarnate Son, whereby He dwelleth in us, and 'we in Him,' and thus as members can indwell and be dwelt in. The Lord's Supper was divinely instituted for those who had really and substantially participated of the flesh and blood of Christ, and by which they had received life; so that in that holy ordinance they did not so much receive life as call to remembrance the ineffable means, viz. the death of Christ, by which they had received it. On the second text Theodoret says, 'All holy baptism is a type of future things.' Again, 'But since He called saving baptism a type of death.' (*Epist. ad Col.*, tom. iii. p. 487).

106. It should be especially noticed that the baptism here represented as a symbol or type is connected with those who are saved in the sight of God, and hence Theodoret calls it 'saving.' In both texts the 'sprinkling of the heart from an 'evil conscience,' as well as the 'body washed with pure water' is implied; 'the answer of a good conscience toward God,' as well as 'putting away the filth of the flesh,' otherwise it could not be a token and seal to those who receive it of blessings which they possess, and a pledge of still greater blessings which they have yet to receive.

107. Augustine is especially to our point; for, as we have seen, he quotes the former text (Rom. vi. 3, 4) for the very purpose we are now quoting it, viz. to show that the sacrament of a thing takes the name of the thing itself, not because it is made the thing, but because it signifies or represents it. (21 3). Bede actually selects the whole passage, with another from Augustine, and gives them as a commentary on the text: "'Know you not," saith he, "that so many " "of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into " "His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism " "into death." (Rom. vi. 3, 4). Whence, except by faith? 'For it is not now perfected in us while we "ourselves groan " "within ourselves."' (Rom. viii. 23-25) (24 22).

108. On the other text under consideration, where circumcision in its sign and thing signified appears to be identical

with baptism, Bede cites an important extract from Augustine occurring in a letter of his to Bishop Paulinus (tom. ii. p. 116) which is as follows: 'He calls that circumcision,' which is signified by circumcision." (*Bede on Col.* ii. 11-13, tom. vi. col. 658).

109. No testimony of antiquity could be more decisive in relation to the first text than that of Origen, who says—

'Now, therefore, wishing to show by these things, what it is to be 'dead to sin, the apostle says, "Know ye not, that so many of us as "were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? "Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death." '(Rom. vi. 3, 4). Teaching by these things, that if any one was 'dead to sin previously, he is necessarily buried with Christ in 'baptism; but if any one is not dead to sin before, he cannot be 'buried with Christ; for no one living is at any time buried. Be- 'cause, if he is not buried with Christ, neither is he legitimately 'baptized. . . . And although, according to the type delivered to the 'churches, all we have been baptized in this visible water, and with 'visible chrism, yet he who is dead to sin, and truly baptized into the 'death of Christ, and buried with Him by baptism into death, that 'man is truly baptized into the Holy Spirit, and with water from 'above. . . . Thou must die to sin before thou canst be buried with 'Christ; for burial ought to be with death. For if thou livest still 'in sin, thou canst not be buried with Christ, nor be placed in His 'new tomb, because thy old man lives, and thou canst not walk in 'newness of life.'—*Epist. ad Rom.*, lib. v. 8, tom. vi., pp. 381, 382.

110. How Dr Pusey can impose upon his too confiding followers by putting them off with such an irrelevant extract from Chrysostom, and omit his real sentiments and those of still more important witnesses, on the point in question, is to us a mystery. Here and elsewhere the question constantly recurs to us—How is it that his disciples, such as Mr Bennett for instance (37 4, 7, 8) allow themselves to be fed with his 'knowledge and understanding?' The fact is they are not really *fed*, nor do they *taste* what is given. In truth, the connection subsisting between Dr Pusey and his followers is not so much represented by that of a shepherd toward his sheep, as by that of a physician toward his patients; and hence it is that they accept what he communicates after the manner in which pills and prescriptions are received where all scrutiny of the senses is studiously avoided, and the why and the wherefore not enquired into. But such is not God's appointed

method of either giving or receiving religious 'knowledge and understanding.'

111. Only let a student with a moderate knowledge of the original Scriptures, and with ordinary powers of mind, diligently, impartially, and devoutly examine the entire testimony of Scripture respecting its sacramental signs and symbols, he must come to the certain conclusion that whether they are the tokens of good received, or pledges of still greater good yet to be received, they *are not* the good of which they are the tokens, nor are they the future good of which they are the pledges; nor, according to their very nature and constitution, are they the appointed instruments of the present good of which they are the symbols, nor of the future good of which they are the pledges, except in a very subordinate degree as aids to faith and encouragements to hold on our way. These remarks especially apply to the two Gospel sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

112. Baptism, in its significant character, has relation to the past, the present, and the future. As true disciples of Christ, and through Him children of God and partakers of the Holy Ghost, we are baptized into the Father, into the Son, and into the Holy Ghost, and thus by that divinely-appointed ordinance we have our participation in the grace of Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, outwardly and significantly confirmed and sealed to us. But however great and unspeakable are the mercies thus confirmed to us in baptism, these are but the first fruits of what we have yet to receive; and in relation to these, baptism, as significant and outward, is a pledge of them.

113. But if this is the true position and standing of those who have received baptism rightly, and if their outward purification by water is the true symbol of spiritual purification by the blood of Christ, what are the blessings designed for them in the Lord's Supper? Certainly not to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ in order to have life in them—this they are verily believed to have already, for they are assumed to be living members of that body of which Christ is the Head; and how can they thus be alive in Christ without a real and substantial participation of the flesh and blood of Christ? for our

Lord himself has solemnly declared—‘ Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.’ (John vi. 53.)

114. We must now bring to a conclusion our direct examination of one-half of the words of institution. The attentive and intelligent reader will not fail to see how far both Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey have wandered, not only from Holy Scripture, but from those sacred paths of early antiquity and of the holy Catholic Church, for which they profess so profound a regard, and in which they occasionally walk when it suits their private ends to do so. Beyond all question it has been demonstrated that the general language of the Old Testament, as well as that of the New, in relation to the covenant, is figurative and elliptical, and the case in the Lord’s Supper is not an exception. Notwithstanding the very solemn and confident assertions to the contrary, we have a figurative locution in the words of institution. Blood, as we have seen, or wine in the Lord’s Supper which represents it, is not really and substantially the covenant, but is, or signifies, that by which the covenant is confirmed. Beyond all question the phrase, ‘ This cup ’ is the new covenant,’ as given by St Luke and St Paul, is a figure of speech ; and the phrase, ‘ This cup is my blood of the ’ new covenant,’ as given by St Matthew and St Mark, is also a figure of speech, unless we make these holy men directly contradict each other. What should be kept in mind or brought to remembrance in this part of the Lord’s Supper, is not the blood simply, nor the new covenant simply, but the new covenant confirmed by the blood of Christ. In all four accounts the cup, or the wine it contains, is [a memorial of, signifies, or represents] the new covenant confirmed by the blood of Christ, or the blood of Christ by which the new covenant is confirmed.

115. We are constrained again to refer to the confident assertions of both Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey, viz., ‘ that Holy Scripture itself determines that there is a figure when there ’ is one.’ (34 7, 35 14, 24.) Holy Scripture affirms, ‘ This ’ cup is the New Testament’ or ‘ Covenant.’ But these words are not explained as a figure either by our Lord or his inspired servants. Now Dr Pusey might very well answer—‘ True ; ’ but our Lord used the ordinary sacramental language of the

‘Jews which was well understood by them, and of course needed ‘no explanation.’ This, certainly, is a correct answer, but an inconvenient one for Dr Pusey—especially so, as he and Dr Wiseman, against ‘universal consent,’ have studiously attempted to prove that the word covenant is not used in a figure in the Old Testament for its token, sign, or condition; but in the passages so alleged it means statute or ordinance, and, therefore, cannot be employed in illustrating the words of institution in the Lord’s Supper. The thoughtful and candid reader, from the evidence given, will not fail to see how egregiously these Doctors have erred, not only in the interpretation of the Scriptures themselves, but as they are interpreted by their own acknowledged authorities, both ancient and modern. Here the question will recur to the same class of readers—If one-half of the language of the words of institution is beyond all question figurative, may not the other half be so also?

CHAPTER IV.

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION OF THE JEWISH PASSOVER EXAMINED AND VINDICATED BY THE TEACHING OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES, AND BY THE GREEK AND LATIN VERSIONS OF THE SAME, ALSO BY THE UNANIMOUS TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY FATHERS AS WELL AS BY MODERN BIBLICAL SCHOLARS, BOTH PROTESTANT AND ROMAN CATHOLIC, AGAINST THE NOVEL CRITICISMS OF DR WISEMAN, DR PUSEY, AND DR WORDSWORTH, THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN; AND ITS TRUE RELATION SHOWN IN REGARD TO THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION IN THE LORD'S SUPPER; WITH AN EXPOSURE OF THE UNFAIR TREATMENT WHICH ZWINGLE RECEIVED AT THE HAND OF DR WISEMAN FOR MAINTAINING THE TRUE AND ANCIENT INTERPRETATION OF THE WORDS 'IT IS THE LORD'S PASS-OVER,' AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE PHRASE 'THIS IS MY BODY.'

1. IN this chapter we have to consider the other part of the words of institution of the Lord's Supper. In that ordinance, as we have already noticed, our Lord calls to our remembrance the fulfilment of two important types, the passover and the blood of the covenant. The latter we have considered, and the result to which we have come has a very important bearing upon the words which we have now to interpret. Respecting the phrase, 'This is my body,' Dr Pusey makes what he calls a simple statement, to the effect that a sentence must be figurative in some part of it, or it is not figurative at all, and he is shrewd enough to believe that this statement is not over simple to be of some avail to his too simple followers. The substance of his remarks will be found 35, 23, 24. He states 'The whole [this is my body] cannot be figurative unless there 'is a figure somewhere in the parts.' Dr Pusey must presume largely upon the general ignorance of his disciples to treat them to such a statement. Admitting that there is no figure in any word of the phrase separately and independently considered, yet, notwithstanding, the phrase viewed as a whole may be figurative. Dr Pusey maintains that Christ affirmed of bread that it was His body. But his more advanced pupils, with Dr Wiseman, Cornelius A Lapide, and the leading Roman Catholic authors, maintain that the phrase 'This bread is my 'body' is figurative. That the reader may see the force and

folly of Dr Pusey's theory it shall be applied to a Scripture phrase which the Fathers generally and Augustine in particular consider as sacramental. 'Such passages, then, as "I am the door," in which the word door is a metaphorical picture word, forms no plea for taking the words "That rock was Christ," figuratively. For the word Christ is not like the word "door" figurative, but is a true person. As plainly there is no figure in the words "that rock," neither does any figure ever lie in the word was. It simply serves to join the two parts of the sentence together, whether there is a figure or no.' In this sacramental phrase Dr Pusey admits 'that he (St Paul) spake in a figure' (35, 15.)

2. The same remarks might also be applied to the sacramental phrase 'It (the lamb) is the Lord's passover,' by which the reader would still further see both the weakness and worthlessness of Dr Pusey's remarks.

3. Dr Wiseman argues that if we might 'interpret the words "This is my body," by the help of "The rock was Christ," then I say, the Socinian has an equal right to interpret the phrase, "The Word was God," by the very same parallelism, and explain it by "The Word *represented* God"' (34, 18.) The simple answer to this is, the two first phrases are by all admitted to be sacramental, the latter is not sacramental but a proper and literal affirmation. The Fathers universally maintain that the consecrated bread is a type, figure, symbol, or image of Christ's body as Dr Pusey admits, but no one can pretend that in the phrase 'The Word was God,' there was any such thing. This contemptible argument of Dr Wiseman, Dr Pusey has reproduced under the thinnest veil of disguise (35, 31.)

4. Both Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey not only maintain that there is no figure in the sacramental phrases of the words of institution in the Lord's Supper, but they maintain the same thing of the sacramental language of the passover which we have now more especially to examine.

5. Do Matthew and Mark say 'This [cup] is my blood of the New Testament,' and Luke and Paul as distinctly state 'This cup is the New Testament?' These cannot be literal locutions, and we think we have made it certain in our preced-

ing chapter that they are not only figures of speech, but figures of speech well known and common in Holy Scripture. But if these are figures of speech, might we not infer with certainty that the phrase 'This [bread] is my body,' is also a figure of speech and not a literal locution? The intelligent and candid reader can answer this question for himself, and we wish such readers to hold fast this portion of the argument while we examine and illustrate this part of the words of institution as we have already done the other part.

6. 'This is my body,' we maintain, is a figurative and not a proper and literal locution. It is common in Holy Scripture to call signs, and especially sacramental signs, by that which they represent or signify, as we have fully shown in a subsequent chapter. (Ch. x.) We have before noticed that our Lord is here substituting the Christian for the Jewish Passover; what more natural than that the phraseology of the one should be identical in style with that of the other. In the accounts given by the Evangelists in relation to that very Passover feast which the Lord replaced by His own Passover feast, we have such figurative locutions as the following:—'After two days is 'the Passover.' (Matt. xxvi. 2. 'Eat the Passover' (v. 17.) 'I will do or keep the Passover.' (v. 18.) 'Made ready the 'Passover.' (v. 19.) 'Killed the Passover.' (Mark xiv. 12.) To understand these as literal and proper locutions would be outrageous in the extreme. Cornelius á Lapide very properly remarks—'For Passover (*pascha*) properly signifies passing 'over, thence metonymically the lamb sacrificed for the passing 'over; and again, the day and the feast on which the lamb 'was sacrificed.' (*On Matt. xxvi. 17.*)

7. The words which Moses was directed to use in the institution of the Jewish Passover, and those which Christ used in instituting the Christian Passover, are identically the same as figurative locutions. Moses says—'It is the Lord's Passover.' (Ex. xii. 11.) Now the lamb was not really the Passover, nor were the lambs which were subsequently sacrificed the original Passover lambs, but memorials of them. The event and its commemoration are expressed thus—'And when I see the 'blood I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon 'you to destroy you when I smite the land of Egypt, and this

'day shall be unto you for a memorial.' (Ex. xii. 13-14.) 'And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand and for 'a memorial between thine eyes.' (Ex. xiii. 9.) The paschal lamb, its sacrifice, or the paschal feast, was not the event but a memorial of it—that is, of the passing over. When St Paul repeated the words of institution as used by our Lord—'This is my body which is broken for you'—and when the same words in the celebration of the Lord's Supper are simultaneously repeated in many Christian congregations, these several statements could not be affirmed of the original body of Christ which was 'broken' or 'given for you,' which 'was *once* offered to bear the sins of many,' any more than the lambs sacrificed in subsequent times were the original lambs, the sprinkling of whose blood on the houses of the believing Israelites was the cause of the Lord's passing over and not suffering the destroying angel to enter. It is not supposable in either case that those solemn events could be performed over again; but, in both cases, they could be brought to mind and be held in remembrance, and this is, in fact, enjoined respecting each. Chrysostom has well said—'Seest thou how He removes and draws them off 'from Jewish customs? For like as ye *did that*, He saith, in 'remembrance of the miracles in Egypt, so *do this* likewise in 'remembrance of me.' (22 6.) Again he says—'And like 'as Moses saith, "This shall be to you for an everlasting "memorial," so He too, "in remembrance of me until I "come."' (22 7.) Our own venerable Bede has well remarked on this point—'When the solemnities of the old Pass-over were ended, which were done in commemoration of the 'ancient deliverance from Egypt, He passed to the new Pass-over which the Church desires to celebrate in memory of her 'redemption—that is to say, for the flesh or blood of the lamb 'substituting a sacrament of His flesh and blood in the figure 'of bread and wine.' (24 4.)

8. Moses in the institution of the Jewish Passover stated—'It (the paschal lamb) is the Lord's Passover.' Our Lord when instituting His own Passover said—'This (bread) is my 'body.' The language of each is nearly identical. There is this difference, however—the Lord instituted the Jewish feast by His servant Moses; Christ Himself instituted His feast.

Had He instituted it by His apostle Peter or any other servant the form must have been altered accordingly—‘This (bread) is the Lord’s body.’ Or had Moses instituted the Jewish Passover in the name of Jehovah the form must have been altered thus—‘This (paschal lamb) is my Passover.’ We are certain the lamb was not the event of the ‘passing over,’ but a memorial of it, or a sign which called attention to it. The same remark might be made on the consecrated bread in the Lord’s Supper. If we have not misunderstood the words of Moses, ‘It is the Lord’s Passover,’ the phrase goes a long way towards determining the meaning of our Lord’s words, ‘This is my body,’ when for the Jewish He substituted His own feast. This has been felt so keenly by modern Romanists and Romanizers that they have invented a new interpretation of the words of Moses, unknown to all antiquity, and, in fact, not heard of until after the Reformation. The ancient and universal interpretation Dr Wiseman had the audacity to ascribe to Zwingle as its author, and Dr Pusey says, ‘others ‘have copied from Zwingle.’ (35 28.) But more of this in the sequel. The maintainers of this novel interpretation whom we shall notice, are Dr Wiseman, Dr Pusey, and Dr Wordsworth, the Bishop of Lincoln. The sentiments of the first and third we shall notice first—those of the second will require a separate consideration.

9. Dr Wiseman, as if to pay a compliment to his own knowledge, seems to admit that the words, ‘It,’ or as he quotes the passage, ‘*This* is the Lord’s Passover,’ may be a figurative form of expression, and is at the trouble to give a reason why it may be so. What he says on this point will be found (34 29, 30.) But he says, ‘There is an important circumstance in the grammatical construction of this passage, noticed ‘by modern commentators, which fairly removes all doubt as ‘to the inapplicability of this text to the illustration of the ‘Eucharist formulas, by proving that the verb has its native ‘signification.’ (34 32.) In two of his principal quotations from the original Hebrew, he has actually changed the order of the Hebrew words as if to favour the point he had to prove. (See 34 32, 33.) His theory in brief is this, that the text in question should be rendered, ‘Passover to the Lord,’ instead

of 'the Lord's Passover.' This he attempts to confirm and illustrate by other texts. He considers that the phrase, 'Sabbath of the Lord,' 'Feast of the Lord,' 'Sacrifice of the Lord's Passover,' should be rendered, 'Sabbath to the Lord,' 'Feast to the Lord,' 'Sacrifice of the Passover to the Lord.' (34 32, 33.)

10. Dr Wordsworth's criticism is to the same effect. He remarks on Ex. xii. 11, 'It is the Lord's Passover,' rather, it is a 'Passover to the Lord. It is offered to the Lord and 'accepted by Him. (Ch. xxxii. 5.) This sense is important, 'because it brings out a special meaning of the Passover in reference to Christ. Christ is the true Passover to the Lord, 'for he offered Himself without spot to God (Heb. ix. 14), and 'was accepted by Him (Eph. i. 6 ; cp. below, v. 27), and it is 'through the blood of His cross that the destroyer passeth 'over us.'

11. '*Passover*, Heb. *pesach*, is a passing over, a sparing, 'from the root *pasach*, to spring, to leap (1 Kings xviii. 26), 'to pass over (1 Kings, v. 4.) In a secondary sense, the word 'Passover is applied, as here, to the paschal Lamb, cp. v. 21, '27 ; Lev. xxiii. 5 ; Num. ix. 6 ; 2 Chro. xxxv. 1, 13. . . . 'The killing of the Passover was a sacrifice.' Again, on the 27th verse, he remarks on the words, 'It is the sacrifice of 'the Lord's passover.' Rather, this is the sacrifice of the 'passover to the Lord ; signally fulfilled in Christ ; see 'above, on v. 11.'

12. In reading this strange piece of criticism, a host of questions present themselves. Does this learned divine know the importance of this text in the controversy between us and Rome ? and how it has been interpreted by all antiquity, and by the most learned and able Roman Catholic commentators of comparatively modern times, as well as by all the great Protestant divines of the sixteenth century ? Does its real catholic interpretation stand in the way of his extreme views on the Eucharist ? (for the Ritualist organs justly claim him as doctrinally belonging to their school.) Is the criticism, after all, the result of want of information as to the real nature of the language, rather than a bold attempt at all hazards to remove a formidable obstruction in the way of in-

terpreting the words of institution in the Lord's Supper literally, which quite eclipses the audacity of Dr Wiseman?

13. We cannot mistake what the Bishop intends to be understood by the word Passover in the two texts in question as he plainly tells us that, 'in a secondary sense it is applied *as here* ' (v. 11) to the paschal lamb.' In confirmation of which, among other texts, we are referred to v. 27, and in regard to this verse he says, 'the killing of the Passover was a sacrifice.' It is not to be disputed but that frequently in Scripture the victims employed in the passover service are called passovers. But we ask if the word passover in these two verses is to be understood in a secondary, or improper sense, in what part of Scripture does it occur in its primary and proper sense? The fact is, if the word passover in these two texts has not its natural and proper meaning, we have no text in Scripture where it has. The Bishop has given us the natural meaning of the word passover in its verbal form, but so as in effect to conceal from the unlearned reader the real import and application of it in the texts in question.

14. The word in its verbal form occurs but seven times, and the following are the instances with the English renderings. Ex. xii. 13, '*I will pass over*;' v. 23, 'The Lord *will pass over*;' v. 27, '*Passed over* the houses;' 2 Sam. iv. 4, '*Became lame*;' 1 Kings xviii. 21, '*Halt*;' v. 26, '*They leaped*;' Isaiah xxxi. 5, '*Passing over* he will preserve.'

15. It seems unaccountable that out of the seven instances the Bishop should have chosen one of the least relevant. (1 Kings xviii. 26.) He apparently chooses two instances, but in one of them, 1 Kings v. 4, the word in question does not occur. Now the first three instances are exact cases in point, and occur in the very chapter where the texts under discussion are found, the latter of the two texts (v. 27) actually explaining what is meant by the word passover, viz., 'The Lord's *Passover* (פסח) who *passed over* (פסח),' &c. It is most extraordinary that Bishop Wordsworth should treat us to a secondary and improper meaning of the word passover, when obviously the proper and natural meaning is the only correct one. If we regard the word 'it,' in both texts (v. 11 and 27) to refer to the Lamb as the Bishop does (this is by no means

certain, for the word it, may be in the place of feast, service, or sacrifice, as we shall have occasion to notice presently), yet Moses did not intend to say as the Bishop represents, 'It (the 'paschal Lamb) is a Passover Lamb to the Lord.' The Bishop, by such an interpretation effectually removes one of the most important texts out of the number of those commonly adduced to illustrate the words of institution in the Lord's Supper. This attempt we shall find before we have done, is useless, if not contemptible.

16. Without doubt, Moses in both these passages taught to Israel and all successive generations of men the object and design of those divine rites, viz., to commemorate the passing over the Israelites in Egypt. But the Bishop's novel and unfounded criticism deprives the sentences in question of all such aim and intent.

17. The word Passover as a noun occurs about fifty times in the Old Testament. Its most frequent occurrence is in the phrases, keep or hold the Passover, literally, do the Passover, that is, perform the whole service as divinely instituted in commemoration of Jehovah's passing over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt. (Ex. xii. 48; Num. ix. 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, 14; Deut. xvi. 1; Jos. v. 10; 2 Kings xxiii. 21, 23; 2 Chro. xxx. 1, 2, 5, and xxxv. 1, 16, 17, 18, 19.) In such words as kill, sacrifice, roast, and eat the Passover, there is more especial reference to the lamb itself. (Ex. xii. 21; Deut. xvi. 2, 5, 6, 7; 2 Chro. xxx. 15, 17, 18, xxxv. 1, 6, 11, 13, and Ezra vi. 19,) as a sacrifice thus employed to commemorate God's passing over. The victims slain for the same purpose are called Passovers. (2 Chro. xxxv. 7, 8, 9.)

18. It is obvious that the Passover could not be done, kept, held, killed, sacrificed, roasted, or eaten in any proper or literal sense, nor could there be literally a day or a feast of it. The word Passover, as historically explained by the pen of inspiration, had relation to a past event of short duration, viz., the Lord's passing over the houses of the Israelites on the memorable night of their coming out of Egypt. We are expressly taught that the Passer-over was Jehovah, and He only (Ex. xii. 13, 23, 27), and from this circumstance we have the word Passover, and the phrase, the Lord's Passover. In

this view of the case, Bishop Wordsworth's interpretation of the phrase, 'It is the Lord's Passover,' as meaning, 'It (the 'lamb) is a passover (lamb) to the Lord,' is utterly at fault. The Lord Himself is really the Passer-over, but to represent Moses as teaching that a passover was offered to the Passer-over is a piece of incongruity which has no existence in fact. Cornelius à Lapide referring to the deliverance of the Israelites remarks, 'hence from this happy passing over, or vaulting over, the lamb sacrificed for it, is called, the Passover, that is, the 'passover sacrifice. "This is the sacrifice offered for this " "passing over, and vaulting over."' (Ex. xii. 11, &c. (*On 1 Epist. Cor. v. 7.*)

19. According to Lapide, the lamb is not a passover to the Lord, but a sacrifice for the passing over of the Lord. Regarding the text as relating to the sacrifice of the first paschal lambs, this no doubt is the sense of the passage. But it should be noticed, that in the account which Moses gives of the institution and commemoration of the deliverance of the Israelites we have undoubted proofs of its being written after that event, and it is quite possible that the words of the eleventh verse may refer not to the first paschal lambs, but to succeeding commemorative ones. Such is really the case in the other parts of the chapter where the paschal offerings are named. But the Bishop has not only misinterpreted the type, but the antitype also. For Christ is not 'the true Passover to the 'Lord.' He is the true Passover Lamb of which the Jewish one was a type, and as the first lambs were offered for the passing over of the Lord, so Christ our Passover Lamb was offered for the passing over of Jehovah. He was not properly the Passer-over, for God the Father was. The Bishop remarks, 'It is through the blood of the cross that the Destroyer passeth 'over us.' This is quite irrelevant to the point in hand. The destroyer is not the passer-over, and is not so called in Scripture. The Lord is said to pass over. It is written, 'The *Lord will pass over* the door and will not suffer the destroyer to come into your houses to smite you.' (Ex. xii. 23.) 'It is said, and the blood shall be to you for a token upon 'the houses where ye are : and when I see the blood, *I will 'pass over* you, and the plague shall not be upon you to de-

'stroy you, when I smite Egypt.' (Ex. xii. 13.) The lamb was not really the Passover, but was the sacrifice, the blood of which being struck on the two side posts, and on the upper door post of the houses was a token Jehovah had promised to regard, and He *passed over* the houses thus marked. As the blood of the first lamb shed for Jehovah's *passing over* was by a figure of speech common to Scripture, called the Passover, so Christ is not really our Passover, but by the sacrifice of Himself is the meritorious cause, to use the sentiment of the type, of the Lord's passing over and not suffering the destroyer to smite us, and by the same figure of speech He is called 'our Passover,' as He is called, 'our Righteousness,' 'our Peace,' and 'our Life.'

20. We reject, then, the sense of the Bishop's novel criticism, which he calls *important*, as well as his *special* but really incongruous meaning which he gives to the word Passover, and cannot but express our surprise that a divine and commentator of such reputed eminence should confound the passover sacrifice with that of the great day of atonement by applying the antitype of the latter to that of the former.

21. It must be admitted that the phrase, 'to the Lord,' as given both by Dr Wiseman and Dr Wordsworth is a more literal rendering of the Hebrew than the words 'of the Lord,' or, 'the Lord's,' and there can be no objection to it, provided it be understood in the sense of belonging to the Lord, that is, the Passover, the Sabbath, the sacrifice of the Passover, as stated above, are the Lord's. But it is certain that neither Dr Wiseman nor Dr Wordsworth attaches that meaning to the several passages which they have selected, and if their interpretation is correct, the phrase is not a figurative locution, and is consequently inapplicable to the purpose for which we have quoted it. That the interpretation in question is alike contrary to the unanimous consent of all antiquity, both as expressed by the Fathers and the ancient versions of the Scriptures, as well as contrary to the Hebrew, as understood by its most able students, admits of easy demonstration.

22. The original is פסח הוא ליהוה '(It (is) the Lord's Passover.)' In the Greek Septuagint there are two readings, κυρίῳ (to the Lord) and κυρίου (the Lord's.) Probably each form of

expression means the same thing. The Latin vulgate made by Jerome, the most learned of all the Fathers, and accepted by the Roman Church is, '*Est enim Phase (id est transitus) DOMINI;*' which, in the English version, called the Douay, accepted by the Roman Church, is fairly translated thus, 'For 'it is the Phase (that is the Passage) of the Lord.'

23. The text quoted jointly by Dr Wiseman and Dr Wordsworth to support their misinterpretation is, Exodus xxxii. 5, which in our version is translated, 'Feast to the 'Lord,' but in the Greek Septuagint, the Latin vulgate, and its Douay translation, we have, 'The Lord's feast.' Had Dr Wordsworth followed the Greek and Latin versions, and had he been guided by an accurate knowledge of the Hebrew, he would have harmonised our English version, not by making Ex. xii. 11 agree with Ex. xxxii. 5, but by making Ex. xxxii. 5 agree with Ex. xii. 11. In that case, the harmony would have been, 'The Lord's Passover,' 'The Lord's Feast,' instead of which, Dr Wordsworth would have 'Passover to the Lord,' 'Feast to the Lord.' It will be seen that Dr Wiseman attaches but little importance to his own authorised versions.

24. In these and the like instances, the Hebrew preposition is used in the sense of *belonging to*. As explanatory of this preposition, Gesenius, in his Hebrew Lexicon, remarks, 'Many of the examples above cited, would properly be translated in Lat. by the *genitive*, in Engl. by the Gen., or by *of* 'with its case; and hence in various other kinds of examples 'also, ל (to) may be taken as a *sign of the genitive*; comp. 'the like use of the Greek dative for the genitive by the 'figure called *κολοφώνιον* e.g., ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, see Bern- 'hardy's Greek syntax, p. 88; also the Gascon idiom, *le fils* 'à Mr A. *s'est marié avec la fille* à Mr B. for *de*. One of the examples which he gives of a case in point is, Isa. ii. 12, 'For the day *to* the Lord,' properly rendered in our version, 'of the Lord.' It is more than probable, that in the texts, Ex. xii. 27, and xx. 10, in the Greek as noticed above, the dative κυρίῳ (to the Lord) is a close imitation of the Hebrew, and ought to be translated in the genitive after the same manner. A very large number of instances might be selected out of the LXX. Dozens of cases occur in the various headings

of Psalms. Thus, 'a Psalm to David,' properly translated a psalm of David, that is, 'David's Psalm.' The Greek is a close imitation of the Hebrew. 'A Psalm to David' ($\tau\tilde{\psi}$ Δαυὶδ), or 'David's Psalm.' But sometimes the same Hebrew form is rendered by the genitive in the Greek; thus, in Ps. xxvi., xxvii., and xxviii., we have $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ Δαυὶδ (David's). In Ps. xvii. and lxxxvi., the same Hebrew form is rendered, 'a Prayer of ($\tau\tilde{\omega}$) David,' and 'a Prayer to ($\tau\tilde{\psi}$) David.' In both instances meaning 'David's Prayer.' It is evident here and elsewhere in the Septuagint, that the dative when it expresses the Hebrew form in question, must in English be translated by the genitive, and very frequently, as above, it expresses this Hebrew form by the genitive. Dr Wordsworth then gets no real help from the Greek for his novel criticism.

25. But both Bishop Wordsworth and Dr Wiseman are sorely at fault with their own boasted canon of interpretation. They set at defiance one of the most cogent instances of consensus which the early Fathers present, and in fact, all the learned commentators down to the Reformation. The divine authority which they strangely claim for their Church, they cast away when it suits their convenience and advance their own private opinions, either invented by themselves, or of very modern origin. This is the charge. It shall now be substantiated in regard to the text under consideration.

26. Tertullian and his pupil Cyprian, both Latin Fathers, always quote the text as follows, '*Pascha est enim Domini.*' (For it is the Lord's Passover) (10 11, and *Adver. Jud.*, lib. ii. cap. 15, Tom. i. p. 41.) Origen, the greatest authority among the Greek Fathers, not only quotes a Greek translation which will not admit of the modern interpretation, but so explains and applies the text as to show that it is absolutely fatal to it. He, in making a contrast (whether correctly or incorrectly, does not affect our question) between the Lord's Passover and the Jews' Passover, quotes the text thus, 'It is the Lord's Passover' ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ ἐστὶ τοῦ κυρίου), and remarks, 'for he does not say, "It is your Passover,"' ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ ἐστὶν ὑμῶν), 'and a little after he thus names the feast, "and it shall come " to pass, if your sons say to you, what is this service, that " ye shall say to them, the sacrifice is the Lord's Passover."

‘(θυσία τὸ πάσχα τοῦ κυρίου.) (Ex. xii. 26, 27). And again, after ‘a few words, “This is the law of the Passover,” &c. (ver. 43.) And again, shortly after, “And if any proselyte shall come “to you to do the Lord’s Passover,” &c. (ποιῇ τὸ πάσχα κυρίου) (ver. 48.) Besides, it should be observed, that nowhere by ‘the sanction of the law is it called “your Passover,” but in ‘these instances which we have cited, it is only once called ‘“Passover,” without any addition, and thrice, “the Lord’s ‘“Passover.”—(*Comment. in Joan.* tom. x. 11, tom. i. pp. 296, 297.) The same sentiments are repeated, tom. xxviii. 20, tom. ii. pp. 371, 372.

27. Athanasius has given us the same interpretation, ‘Even ‘as Moses, when teaching Israel not to consider the feast as ‘pertaining to the days, but to the Lord, “It is the Lord’s ‘“Passover.” To the Jews, forsooth, when they thought they ‘celebrated the Passover, because they persecuted the Lord, ‘the feast was useless; since it no longer bore the name of the ‘Lord, even according to their own testimony. It was not ‘the Passover of the Lord, but that of the Jews. The passover ‘was named after the Jews, my brethren, because they denied the ‘Lord of the Passover.’ (*Pasch.*, Lett. vi. pp. 45, 46, Oxf. Tr.)

28. The Greek Fathers, as well as the Latin, almost universally quote the phrase thus, ‘It is the Lord’s Passover’ (πάσχα ἐστὶ κυρίου), and not ‘It is a Passover to the Lord’ (κυρίῳ), we have found no exceptions to this rule. If the latter was a reading in the Septuagint manuscripts of their times, they evidently interpreted it as meaning not something done to the Lord, but as appertaining or belonging to the Lord, viz., ‘The Lord’s ‘Passover.’ Gregory Nazianzen so quotes and applies the phrase. (*Ora.* 42, tom. i. p. 676) so Chrysostom (*De Prode, Judæ*, Ser 30, tom v. p. 462), and so Theodoret (*In Ex.* xii. 11, *Interr.* 24, tom. i. p. 139). Cyril of Alexandria frequently quotes the passage and distinctly explains the word passover in that connection, not as denoting the paschal sacrifice, but as an act of the Lord, viz., His passing over. Thus quoting the words ‘It is the Lord’s (κυρίου) passover,’ he remarks, ‘that is the passing over’ (διεπαζέειν). (*Glaph. in Ex.* lib. ii. p. 227, See also p. 219, and *De Festis Pasch.*, Hom. 16, pp. 189, 190.)

29. Greek authors interpret the Hebrew word and its

Greek equivalent literally as passing over, and in a sense less proper as sacrifices for a passing over. Thus Philo says, 'Passover (πάσχα) is called,' and 'is interpreted a passing over' (διάβασις). (*De Sac. Abel et Cain, and De Migra. Abra. Opera*, pp. 140, 392). Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities*, and Symmachus in his Greek version of the Old Testament, interpret the word in question as 'a stepping' or 'passing over.'

30. Jerome of all the Fathers was most competent to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures, as well as the ancient Greek version of them. In the account given of the institution of the Passover, in his translation of the Holy Scriptures, we have the phrase, 'the Lord's Passover,' three times (Ex. xii. 11, 27, 48). Herein he agrees with Origen, as may be seen above. For more than a thousand years this version has been received by the Roman Church, and during the last three hundred years has been accepted by it as all but, if not quite, infallible. It is marvellous how Romanists, and Dr Wiseman in particular, can cast aside their own most binding authorities when it suits their convenience.

31. Bishop Gaudentius, like Origen, Athanasius, and other Greek Fathers, quotes the text as Tertullian and Cyprian had done before, '*Pascha est enim Domini*' (For it is the Lord's Passover), and applies it not only to the type in the Jewish Passover, but to the antitype in the Christian Passover; regarding the mysteries in the Jewish and Christian Passover as being alike. The phrase, 'the Lord's Passover,' in his mind was as suitable to the Lord Jesus Christ, as our Paschal Lamb, as it was to the Jewish paschal lamb (19 1, 7).

32. The great Augustine bears the same testimony. He says, 'But more openly was the passion of Christ prefigured among that people, in that they were commanded to slay and eat a lamb, and with part of its blood to mark their door-posts, and to celebrate this every year, and to call it "the Lord's Passover"' (*Pascha Domini*) (*De Cat. Rud.*, c. xx., tom. iv., p. 304).

33. We must now more especially examine Dr Wiseman's novel interpretation of the words, 'It is the Lord's Passover,' in answer to Zwingle. The latter, unwisely perhaps, narrated a

dream he had had in which he was led to this text, and its application as the key of interpretation to the words, 'This is my body.' We have given this dream in full as quoted by Dr Wiseman (34 27). The dream surely was harmless and innocent, and, if we may judge from our own experience, it was natural; for what is the subject of intense thought when awake, often lingers with us when asleep, and in the morning we may awake not only refreshed with sleep, but sometimes profited by our dreams, not that anything new has been put into the mind, but something stored up in its hidden recesses has been evolved and brought to the surface. Most likely Zwingle had often read the text as it stood in Jerome's version, if not also expositions of it in what were the ordinary commentaries of his times. Those of Nicolas de Lyra, and Tostatus, Bishop of Avila, which we shall have occasion to notice, were admirably adapted to serve his purpose.

34. Let the reader note well what treatment Zwingle gets at the hands of Dr Wiseman. This dutiful son of Rome represents him as a mad enthusiast, and idiot, an incoherent raver, a suggester of a palmary argument, a cheater, one that was led by a lying spirit (34 28). Probably such vile abuse was never more out of place. Should it occur to the reader that Zwingle had given some grounds for these severe remarks as he was not sure whether the monitor was white or black, and so Dr Wiseman concludes that it was a black demon, and not a white angel, it should be noticed that Zwingle, by the phrase 'white or black,' was not really referring to the agency of a good or an evil spirit at all, but simply using a well-known proverbial expression, merely equivalent to this, 'I can give no account of the matter.' Aubertin in his great work, *De Eucharistice Sacramento*, shows that the phrase is used in that sense by elegant Latin authors, is so explained by Erasmus, and is so employed by Jerome (p. 67). Elsewhere, too, Zwingle himself frequently so uses it. Dr Wiseman, after this round of abuse, shows how the text in question should not be interpreted. He introduces the right key of interpretation; but, instead of using it, he throws it away (34 30). Abandoning this key, which we consider the right one, he substitutes what he calls 'a very simple and

'natural translation,' so that instead of the words 'this is the Lord's Passover,' we should have 'this day or festival is the Lord's Passover,' and he says 'it would then no more mean "this is a figure of the Lord's Passover" than "this is "Easter-day" means that it is a figure of that holy day' (34 31).

35. From this illustration, we should draw an opposite conclusion, as Augustine did. Being a sort of oracle in the age in which he lived, he yields to the request of a bishop, and instructs him in the meaning of sacramental language, showing that sacraments in Holy Scripture are called by the name of that which they signify, but are not really what they are called, any more than the Passover (or Easter-day), in its annual occurrence is really the time of the Lord's Passion, although when that season draws near we may say to-morrow is the Lord's passover (see the full account as given by Augustine himself) (21 2, 3). But Dr Wiseman has not so stated his illustration as to make it a case in point, as he easily might have done, and as we shall now do for him. A Jew on the near approach of the Passover might say, 'To-morrow is the day of the Lord's Passover,' as on Easter-eve the Christian might say, 'To-morrow is the day of the Lord's resurrection.' Neither of these can be taken as literal phrases, but either of them may be taken as a figurative or elliptical one, the full sense being to this effect, 'To-morrow is the day observed in remembrance of the Lord's Passover,' or 'of the Lord's resurrection.'

36. Dr Wiseman's altered translation gives him no real help, his own commentators being judges. Nicolas de Lyra regards the word 'it,' or as Dr Wiseman calls it, 'this,' as referring not merely to the paschal lamb, but to the whole feast, yet says, 'But this feast, which signifies (*significat*) 'passing over, is called the Passover. (In Ex. xii. 11).

37. Aquinas states on 1 Cor. v. 7, 'But that figurative lamb was called the Jews' Passover, because it was sacrificed 'in token of the passing over.' On the same verse the voluminous Roman Catholic commentator Tostatus, Bishop of Avila, says, 'It (the lamb) is called the Lord's Passing over, 'because the smiting angel, by the command of God, passed

‘over the Hebrews without smiting them.’ A little further on he remarks, ‘For that lamb was not the passover, but is ‘called the passover according to a causal predicate, and not ‘a formal one (*secundum predicationem causalem, et non ‘formalem*), which the Scripture often uses, and this mode is ‘observed in all the books of sacred Scripture where it treats ‘of this feast.’ And then he gives instances both from the Old and New Testament.

38. But Dr Wiseman, not being content with his ‘simple and natural translation’ of the passage, has recourse to what he says is its ‘grammatical construction,’ and calls in the aid of a learned Protestant (34 32). The text then translated according to this grammatical construction, and of course retaining his simple and natural translation, is, ‘This (day or ‘festival) is the paschal feast sacred to the Lord’ (34 32, 33). But this so-called grammatical translation no more helps Dr Wiseman than his ‘simple and natural’ one. We, however, deny that the above is the grammatical construction of the passage. ‘Sacred’ or ‘holy to,’ and ‘most sacred’ or ‘holy to the Lord,’ are common Hebrew phrases (Ex. xxx. 10 ; Lev. xxvii. 23, 28 ; Num. vi. 8). The important difference between these phrases and the one in question is, that in the one case the word ‘sacred’ is used, and in the other it is left out. Rosenmüller does not state that it is the grammatical construction of the passage, but rather gives it as its sense, and to this we see no objection. That the form of expression we are now considering cannot admit of the word holy as any part of the grammatical construction, is obvious from the fact that sometimes it is followed by the phrase ‘holy to the ‘Lord,’ either as interpretative of it, or as expressing the right of possessing more strongly. Thus we have, ‘The fruit ‘of the tree is to the Lord (the Lord’s), it is holy to the ‘Lord’ (Lev. xxvii. 30).

39. But what advantage does Dr Wiseman get from this criticism? It is adduced to prove ‘that the verb has its ‘native signification’ (34 32). But what he calls the verb (for there is no verb in the Hebrew) is not in the least affected by it. Before proving this, we must give the remainder of his argument. He goes on to say, ‘But this

'rendering is placed beyond all controversy by a passage perfectly parallel, in the very chapter from which the objection is drawn, which, if Zwinglius had possessed the sagacity to compare, he would not have become the instrument of ensnaring his unlearned auditors. I allude to the twenty-seventh verse, in which we read of this very sacrifice as follows : "This is to the Lord the sacrifice of passover or pasch"' (34 33).

40. We must now more definitely examine and compare these translations of Dr Wiseman, beginning with the first in order, which is, 'This (day or festival) is the paschal feast 'sacred to the Lord' (Ex. xii. 11). But surely Moses did not need to inform the Israelites that a paschal festival *is* a paschal feast. But Dr Wiseman thought differently, as we shall see by his interpretation of the other text. The translation is, 'This is to the Lord the sacrifice of passover.' Do we ask what is to the Lord the sacrifice, &c.? He answers, 'This paschal feast is to the Lord the sacrifice of passover.' For, he says, 'Here the paschal feast is spoken of not as any 'emblem of the Lord's passover, but as its sacrifice' (34 33). When the Israelites had entered the land of promise, and were keeping the seven days' feast of the passover and doing its sacrifice, according to all the particulars divinely appointed, and their children said unto them, What mean ye by this service? by all these acts and ceremonies? According to Dr Wiseman the answer to this is, 'This paschal feast, or feast 'of the passover, is to the Lord the sacrifice of passover;' and, as a natural consequence, of so sapient an answer, the young Israelites would infer that the sacrifice of the passover was the feast of the passover, which is a piece of unnecessary information; and, in fact, is no answer whatever to their question. That the reader may see the force and the folly of Dr Wiseman's 'natural and simple translation,' and translation according to the 'grammatical construction of the passage,' both shall be given with their contexts as translated in his own version, said to be received by the Roman Church as infallible: 'And 'thus you shall eat it: you shall gird your reins, and you 'shall have shoes on your feet, holding staves in your hands, 'and you shall eat it in haste; for *this (day or festival) is the*

'*paschal feast sacred to the Lord.*' (Ex. xii. 11). 'And when ye have entered into the land which the Lord will give you, as he hath promised, you shall observe these ceremonies. and when your children shall say to you : What is the meaning of this service? you shall say to them : *This (paschal feast, or feast of the passover) is to the Lord the sacrifice of pass-over or pasch,* when he passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, striking the Egyptians, and saving our houses.' (Ex. xii. 27.) Beyond all question, when Moses said, 'It is the passover to the Lord,' or as more intelligible to the English reader, 'The Lord's passover,' he was declaring to the Israelites the end and purpose of those rites and ceremonies which he was then instituting, viz., to keep in remembrance the *Lord's passing over* and sparing their families. In fact, that the whole service was 'for a sign . . . and for 'a memorial' of that remarkable event.

41. Dr Wiseman and Dr Wordsworth in their extreme solicitude to explain away a manifest figure of speech, shut their eyes to the solemn and interesting event which the pass-over rites were intended to commemorate, and instead of telling us what was the object of their institution, represent Moses, as we have seen, as making irrelevant if not foolish statements.

42. As Dr Wiseman casts aside the interpretations of his learned commentators on the 11th verse, so he does on the 27th verse. Tostatus quoting from it the words, '*It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passing over*' (*transitus*), remarks, 'that is, this is the sacrifice done in remembrance of the Lord's passing over, namely, when God, smiting the first born of Egypt passed over our houses doing no injury as stated below.' Vatabler, both on the 11th and the 27th verses is equally against Dr Wiseman. Cornelius á Lapide in his commentary which he wrote about A.D. 1616, answered Zwingle in a very different manner from Dr Wiseman, so much so, in fact, that the latter, by anticipation, is answered by one of the most learned and able commentators of his own Church. Lapide gives Zwingle's argument as follows:— 'Zwingle argues, "If this is a true proposition, *the lamb is* " *the passover*, then it must be admitted, that in it a figure of " speech is declared; therefore the same figure must be ad-

““mitted in these words of Christ, *this is my body*, so that
 ““the sense is, This is a figure of my body.” And Zwingle
 ‘adds, that this argument was revealed to him by a spirit,
 ‘whether white or black he did not know, and that thereupon
 ‘he convinced the Helvetians, that the body of Christ is not
 ‘really in the Eucharist, but only figuratively.’ Lapidé
 thought it safe to admit Zwingle’s premisses, but denied his
 conclusion. ‘For the lamb,’ he says, ‘cannot be properly the
 ‘passover, that is, the passing over, for passing over and lamb
 ‘are two things absolutely separate, one of which cannot be
 ‘the other, but when I say, “This is my body,” *this* and *body*
 ‘are not contraries, but the pronoun *this* vaguely signifies the
 ‘same thing which the *body* signifies absolutely : therefore, in
 ‘this proposition, *the lamb is the passover*, that is the passing
 ‘over, a figure of speech must be necessarily admitted, but
 ‘not in this proposition, “*This is my body*.”’

43. What Zwingle contended for respecting the words, ‘It
 ‘is the Lord’s passover,’ being a figure, is here admitted, and
 instead of á Lapidé blaming Zwingle for want of sagacity, as
 Dr Wiseman does for not comparing the eleventh verse with
 the twenty-seventh, he shows his sagacity in passing over the
 twenty-seventh verse in silence.

44. Dr Wiseman, then, in the interpretation of the text in
 question is against the ancient versions, the Fathers generally,
 and the early commentators, including those of his own church
 in the sixteenth century.

45. We have now to examine Dr Pusey’s criticisms on the
 same words, ‘It is the Lord’s passover,’ which are given
 in full. (35 27). We are told that the word Passover in
 this phrase is elliptical, but not figurative. The ellipsis he
 supplies from the 27th verse, and we see no objection to his
 doing so. The text thus interpreted with Dr Pusey’s mean-
 ing to the word Passover is, ‘It is the sacrifice of the Lord’s
 ‘Passover lamb,’ and accordingly the 27th verse is to be under-
 stood exactly in the same sense. But if this is what Moses
 really intended to teach, then both are literal forms of speech,
 and afford us no aid in our interpretation of the words of
 institution in the Lord’s Supper. This, of course, is the aim
 and object of Dr Wiseman in giving his criticism, and of Dr

Pusey in retailing it. Dr Pusey further informs us, that the word Passover means also its feast, as in Exodus xii. 48. 'Will keep the Passover,' and supplies the ellipsis from Ex. xxxiv. 25. 'The sacrifice of the feast of the passover.' According to Dr Pusey's teaching, meaning in each case simply the Passover feast; and, of course, these phrases, like the others, he regards as literal ones. Without repeating our former arguments and illustrations, we shall here appeal to the teaching of one of the most famous Hebrew scholars of modern times. Professor Lee, in his Hebrew Lexicon, under the word פסח (passover), explains 'Passing over will probably be its 'exact sense. Thence the Passover.' He then cites the texts, Exodus xii. 27, and xxxiv. 25, as instances where the word passover is to be understood in its literal and natural sense, but refers to other texts where it stands for the paschal lamb. According to Professor Lee, the word passover in both these texts means not as Dr Pusey appears to teach, the passover lamb, and the passover feast, but the Passing over of the Lord, meaning, in one case, a sacrifice in memory of it, in the other, a feast in memory of it.

46. Dr Pusey informs us, "It is the Lord's Passover," does 'not mean, "It is a sign of the Lord's passing over." The 'lamb was not a sign, and is not so called.' (35 27). Here he follows Bellarmine, who, citing the Latin vulgate, 'the lamb 'is the Passover, that is, the Passing over,' remarks, 'For the 'paschal lamb was not called the Passover figuratively, because 'it signified the Passover, for there is no resemblance between 'the slaying of a lamb and the Lord's passing over.' (*De Sac. Euch.* lib. i. c. xi., tom. iii. cc. 440, 441.) Suppose we admit that both these disciples of Paschasius are right, we are not hindered from regarding the lamb as a memorial of the Lord's passing over. Dr Pusey himself tells us, 'that the whole 'festival *was* a memorial of the Lord's Passing over, and is so 'called.' (35 27.) Applying Dr Pusey's own key of interpretation to the three texts, we probably shall have their exact sense. 'It (the lamb) is a sacrifice for a memorial of the 'Lord's Passing over.' (Ex. xii. 11.) 'It is the sacrifice for a 'memorial of the Lord's passing over.' (v. 27.) 'The sacrifice of 'the feast for a memorial of the Lord's Passing over.' (xxxiv. 25.) Dr Pusey states further, "'Keep the Passover to the Lord," (Ex.

'xii. 48) occurs of the festival ; to "sacrifice the Passover to "the Lord," of the paschal lamb.' (Deut. xvi. 2.) These texts admit of the same interpretation as that given of those above. 'Keep (literally do), the feast for a memorial or sign of the Lord's Passing over.' 'Sacrifice the sacrifice for a memorial or sign of the Lord's Passing over.' If our version is correct, as we believe it to be, and as we have seen, is in exact accordance with antiquity and universal consent in giving the correct sense to the English reader by rendering the Hebrew idiom in Exodus xii. 11. 'The Lord's Passover,' it certainly is less correct in rendering in the above two instances, exactly the same Hebrew idiom, 'Passover to the Lord.' The literal rendering given to the first of these texts (Ex. xii. 48) in the Latin vulgate is 'Do the Lord's Passover.' 'Sabbath to the Lord,' is one of Dr Pusey's private renderings, suitable for the occasion, but liable to mislead the English reader. The proper translation is given in the English version and Latin vulgate, 'Sabbath of the Lord.' (Ex. xx. 10.)

47. We maintain, then, that the sacrifice or feast was not literally the Passover, but a memorial or sign of it. In like manner, we hold that in the words of institution, the bread is not literally the body of Christ, but a memorial of it.

48. Dr Pusey, in conclusion, informs us that 'There is then absolutely nothing remarkable in this idiom, which Zwingle relates to have come to him in a dream, as an illustration of 'our Lord's words, "This is my body," and which others have 'copied from him.' (35 28.) No, certainly not, for it is very common in the Holy Scriptures, and especially in all sacramental language, to call the signs, symbols, or sacrifices, &c, by the names of the objects to which they relate, or of which they are the memorials. But Dr Wiseman's and Dr Pusey's treatment of this idiom and of the use Zwingle made of it is very remarkable, and should be marked well. Both these men would persuade us (34 27, 28, 33 ; 35 28), that Zwingle originated this exposition of the text in question, and that others have simply copied it from him. Whereas it is as old as the earliest Christian Fathers, and was most emphatically held by the leading commentators in common use before the Reformation, as well as by some Roman Catholic expositors since.

CHAPTER V.

DR PUSEY'S AND MR MAKONOCHE'S DOUBTFUL ANALOGY BETWEEN GOD MAKING MAN A LIVING SOUL, AND DIVINE POWER MAKING THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, CONSIDERED AND SHEWN TO BE FALSE. DR PUSEY'S ASSUMPTION THAT OUR LORD WAS BORN WITH A SPIRITUAL BODY, PASSED WITH IT THROUGH A SOLID BLOCK OF STONE AND CLOSED DOORS, AND SUBSISTS AFTER THE SAME MANNER IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS, PROVED TO BE UNSCRIPTURAL AND HERETICAL. HIS MISAPPLICATION OF A PART OF 1 COR. X. 16-21 IN FAVOUR OF HIS DOCTRINE CORRECTED, AND THE WHOLE SHEWN NOT TO BE FOR, BUT AGAINST IT.

1. IF the conclusions to which we have come in the previous chapters, are legitimate, it would seem to be unnecessary to consider any subsidiary arguments and illustrations which are only of value as they support the main arguments, while, if the main arguments are worthless, subsidiary ones are useless. Nevertheless, an examination of them in this case will tend to show the inherent weakness of the system which they are employed to defend, and will discover the miserable shifts to which even a man of reputed learning like Dr Pusey, is sometimes driven in support of his doctrines. He and most of his followers maintain, that bread after the consecration in the Lord's Supper, although it has, in their opinion, become the Body, Soul, and Divinity of Christ, is, notwithstanding, bread still; and that after consecration, the bread may be called bread or body according as the sacrament is viewed outwardly, or inwardly in its higher or lower part. A strange conception truly, but by way of making it appear less strange Dr Pusey gives, or rather tries to make out a parallel case. He states, 'Holy Scripture says, "man became a living soul;" 'without implying that he ceased to be material.' (35 8.) Again, he says, 'We cannot, then, infer that our Blessed Lord's words, "This is my Body," convey His whole teaching 'as to the Holy Eucharist. They declare one truth; they deny none. They affirm what it is; they do not deny it to be also physically what it was, any more . . . than the saying

“man became a living soul,” implies that he was not also ‘flesh.’ (35 9.)

2. The analogy which Dr Pusey here attempts to institute is false, and rests upon an unfounded assumption. It must be proved that the materials of bread and wine become by consecration Christ’s body and blood, as Dr Pusey seems to think that man already made flesh afterwards became a living soul by God breathing into him the breath of life. But if we admit his assumption, the case here adduced to illustrate and confirm it, is a most unfortunate one. The fact is, man was made flesh by being made a living soul. Of course, he could not cease to be flesh by becoming a living soul, because it was by becoming a living soul that he was made flesh. Mr Makonochie, as quoted by Mr Cobb in the first part of his ‘Kiss of Peace,’ in stating a similar argument to that of Dr Pusey has avoided one of his errors, but has fallen into another. He says, ‘God made man of the dust of the earth. Here we have the senseless, lifeless form. “God breathed into his “nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.” He did not cease to be what he was before—dust of the earth, but he became what he was not before—a living soul. So in the Eucharist, God made bread and wine of the dust of the earth. God the Holy Ghost breathes over it in the act of consecration. It does not cease to be what it was before, but it becomes what it was not before—the life-giving Body and Blood of Christ.’ (Pp. 81, 82.) We maintain that man by becoming a living soul thereby ceased to be dust. It is true it is stated ‘Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.’ But it might be asked if living man is dust already, how can he be spoken of as capable of returning to it? The sacred record does not mean to say that man is dust, but rather that he is of dust. The literal Hebrew states, ‘the Lord God formed man—dust,’ meaning, of course, of dust, or from dust. So again, the phrase ‘thou art dust,’ meaning of course, of, or from, dust. We read expressly not that living man is really dust, but *from* dust, ‘All are *of* [*from*] dust, and all turn to dust again.’ (Eccles. iii. 20.) Man as a living soul is not dust, but is *of* or *from* it, and when he ceases to be a living soul, or an animated being, he will become dust

again. Thus far, neither Dr Pusey nor Mr Makonochie gets any help from their novel application of this text.

3. But Dr Pusey would have his unlearned readers suppose (for he surely must know better himself) that the word *soul* in our version, and the Hebrew term of which it is a translation, are the same in meaning as the word *soul* now used in our ordinary speech. But the meaning is essentially different in the Hebrew Scriptures, the word being applied to all animated beings, and is as much characteristic, of fish, reptiles, winged creatures, and animals, as it is of mankind. A few passages from the Old Testament literally translated will make this obvious to the ordinary reader. 'The moving creature that hath *soul*.' Every living *soul* that moveth,' (Gen. i. 20, 21.) 'The earth bringing forth the living *soul*.' (v. 24.) 'Everything wherein there is a living *soul*.' (v. 30.) 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living *soul*.' (Gen. ii. 7.) 'All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died,' (Gen. vii. 22.) 'Every living *soul* that moveth.' (Lev. xi. 46.) 'The *soul* of all flesh is the blood.' (xvii. 14.) 'And he that killeth any *soul* of man shall surely be put to death. He that killeth the *soul* of a beast shall make it good, *soul* for *soul*.' (Lev. xxiv. 17, 18.) 'Shall come at no dead *soul*.' (Num. vi. 6.)

4. When Dr Pusey says that man became a living *soul* without it being implied that he ceased to be material, we reply, of course not; for in the Hebrew Scriptures, the term *soul* is never properly applied to anything but what is material. The word, however, is sometimes technically used in the same sense as we use the word "hands," "self," "person," &c., and 'in relation to God it is said, my *soul* hateth.' (Isa. i. 14.) If Dr Pusey had said 'man became flesh by becoming a living *soul*,' instead of intimating that he might be a living *soul* independent of flesh, he would probably have stated the exact truth.

5. Both in the Old and New Testament man is spoken of as possessing a tripartite nature, viz., body, *soul*, and spirit. (1 Thess. v. 23.) Two of these, body and *soul*, are common to man and to the irrational brute, but man possessing spirit, differs

essentially from the brute. And we know, that from the first, 'God formed the spirit of man within him.' (Zech. xii. 1.) According to the teaching of St Paul, this higher part of man is that only to which the resurrection body will be adapted, and man's sensuous nature and animal body will extend only to the grave. (1 Cor. xv. 44-48.) Dr Pusey tells us that 'man' is called "soul," or "flesh," *i.e.*, by his higher or lower part, as 'the occasion suggests to speak of him, according to that which is noblest, or that which is weakest in him.' (35 50.) The word soul, as we have seen, is commonly applied to both mankind and irrational creatures, but the word flesh, meaning living flesh, is an appellation more commonly applied to mankind. It is certain, according to the Hebrew Scriptures, that the word soul applied to man is no higher title, and implies no more than the word flesh does. This appears to receive confirmation from the New Testament. Our Lord speaking of His human or sensitive nature, says, 'The bread that I will give is my *flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world.' (John vi. 51.) 'I lay down my *soul* for the sheep, because I lay down my *soul*.' (x. 15, 17.) 'To give his *soul* a ransom for many.' (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45.) We may presume that the words flesh and soul in this connection are each equally descriptive of Christ's sacrifice of himself.

6. Of the sacrament, Dr Pusey says, 'no one ever did, or could call the outward and visible part of the sacrament, by the name of the inward and invisible, meaning that it was identical with the invisible.' But the flesh of man can with truth be called by the name of soul, meaning that it is identical with soul. We read, 'To destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven.' (Gen. vi. 17.) But creatures in whose flesh is the breath of life, are called living souls. (Gen. ii. 7.) From which we learn that there cannot be living flesh without living soul, or living soul without living flesh. The analogy attempted by Dr Pusey entirely breaks down. It is surpassingly strange that a Hebrew scholar should ever have attempted to make it.

7. Another shift which we have to notice is his reasoning very much in the style of the heretics Valentinus and Marcion, in his assuming that Christ was born with a spiritual body,

and with the same spiritual body passed through the unremoved block of stone placed at the door of the sepulchre. (35 11.) At present we have only to do with what saith the Scripture; where we read of a spiritual Rock which was Christ, and which Dr Pusey has correctly interpreted (35 15); but a spiritual body he understands to be a real body present after the manner of a spirit, of which we have not the remotest hint in Holy Scripture. That Christ had a material and not a spiritual body, is expressly taught in Scripture in opposition to those heretics who denied it. (1 John i. 1.) To maintain, as Dr Pusey does, that Christ was born with a spiritual body, and that with the same spiritual body he passed through the sealed tomb, and through the closed doors of a room, 'as He had passed through the 'doors of the virgin's womb' (35 11), and to argue that it is the same spiritual body which is eaten in the Lord's Supper, is to adopt the almost identical heresy of Marcion, which many Fathers were at great pains to refute. A spiritual body, such as Dr Pusey here conceives of, is an absurdity. It is true, we have the Scripture phrase, 'spiritual body,' but it would be as impossible for this body to pass through a sealed tomb without displacing any of its parts as it would be for a 'natural body,' the body we now have. 'It is sown a natural body, it is 'raised a spiritual body.' (1 Cor. xv. 44.) *Natural* is not here equivalent in meaning to *material*. It is of the very essence of the body to be material. *Spiritual*, therefore, cannot be understood as the reverse of *material*, for in this sense a spiritual body is a contradiction in terms; it is no better sense than a material spirit—a spirit of flesh and blood. Nor is there any reason to think that *spiritual* is used as equivalent to *aeriform*, in opposition to *solid*. The word translated *natural* has no such signification as solid; and its true meaning must determine the meaning of *spiritual*, which is opposed to it. The word rendered *natural* is derived from the word *soul*, as the word rendered *spiritual* is derived from *spirit* in a corresponding sense. It is certain we are not here to conceive of a 'spiritual body,' being more immaterial than the 'natural body' which we now have. The spiritual body of which Dr Pusey speaks can have no other existence than in his imagination, and is contrary to reason and revelation.

8. Passing to another point, for the statement of which we refer to the extracts from the writings of Dr Pusey (35 17). Every part of this demands an examination. We readily accept the first part of the statement, and are glad to follow the apostle's interpretation and expansion of our Lord's words. But what does the apostle mean by his own words? We can learn that by consulting the context which Dr Pusey has overlooked. This will be better understood by giving a translation in which words which are alike in the Greek have one uniform rendering. Such a translation is the one made by Dr Waterland which here follows. The interpolations in brackets are our own.

9. 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not *a communion* [or *the fellowship*] of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not *a communion* [or *the fellowship*] of the body of Christ? For since the bread is one, we, being many, are one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread. Behold, Israel after the flesh, are not they who eat of the sacrifices, *communicants* [or *in the fellowship*] of the altar? What say I then? That the idol is anything? Or that what is offered in sacrifice to the idol is anything? But, I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God, and I would not have you *become communicants* [or *come into the fellowship*] of devils. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: you cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils.' (1 Cor. x. 16-21).

10. Dr Pusey maintains that when our Lord said, 'This is my body,' He meant that it actually was His body, though under the form of bread, and that the bread when duly consecrated becomes the body of Christ. He then asserts that 'St Paul's words are an expansion and application of our Lord's words,' (35 17). So that in his opinion, when the apostle said, 'The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ,' there was a participation by the mouth of the real body of Christ actually in or under the form of consecrated bread. But the object the apostle had in view led him to speak not only of a communion or fellowship of the body and blood of Christ, but also of being communi-

cants, or in the fellowship of the Jewish altar, and of becoming communicants or coming into the fellowship of devils, as may be seen in the above extract from his teaching. The nature of the apostle's argument requires that what is meant by any one of these three communions or fellowships is meant by all three. Will Dr Pusey take the apostle's words literally when he speaks of becoming communicants, or coming into the fellowship of devils or demons? Will he maintain that the heathens at Corinth in or under the form of consecrated meats and drinks, did really eat and drink devils? For Christ to be present in the consecrated elements, so as to be received by the mouth of every partaker, he requires 'the most marvellous of miracles' (35 67): will he call to his aid similar miracles in this sacramental language respecting demons? The reader will know what answer to give and how to apply the argument.

11. But Dr Pusey further tells us, 'There is no bond between a communion and a figure. Had the holy Eucharist been only a figure, there would be nothing whereof it could be a communion. . . . That which is seen is an image of the reality which is unseen. Yet God says not by St Paul 'it is an image, but it is "the communion of the body of "Christ." But, in order to be a communion of it, there must be that of which it is the communion' (35 17). In answer to the latter part of this extract, we remark that Dr Pusey might just as well have argued as follows, and about as conclusively as in the former case. 'God says not by St Paul it is an image, but it is the communion or the fellowship of demons. But, in order to be a communion or fellowship of them, there must be those (in or under the form of consecrated meats and drinks) of whom it is the communion or fellowship.' Dr Pusey could not apply his argument in this case. Assuredly he ought not to apply it in the former.

12. In reference to the former part of the extract, it must be admitted that there is no bond between a communion and a figure; and we are certain that the Eucharist, or sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is not only a figure, but is in its completeness that which is figured. Not that the

signs contain the things signified, or are the things signified, as Dr Pusey contends. Yet the figures or consecrated signs may be the medium through which the believer has communion or fellowship with that which is signified. For instance, the consecrated bread and wine were not really the body and blood of Christ, but were the medium of having fellowship with them. So the meats and drinks consecrated by the heathen were not their demons, but the medium of their holding fellowship with them. The doctrine of Dr Pusey is, that there can be no communion by an image unless it contains that of which it is an image. But herein his doctrine is exactly the opposite of that of the ancient Catholic Church and the plain teaching of Holy Scripture. In Scripture the life or salvation of the sinner is nowhere made, in the first instance, dependent on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To come to the Lord's Supper rightly, there must first be a participation of life, and that by eating the flesh and blood of Christ; and this is what the Fathers themselves teach, as we have shown in a subsequent chapter (vii. 40-45). Further, we are expressly taught that 'whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' How the heathen sinner can come to this unspeakable blessing we learn from what follows. 'How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher.' (Rom. x. 13, 14). We justly infer from this how the sinner is brought into saving contact with the blessed Saviour, viz., through the medium of sounds, signs, or images, but none of these things contained or were in themselves that which they denoted, yet they were the medium of life or salvation to the soul, which of course could not take place without a participation of Christ's body and blood, for He Himself has said, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of God, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you' (John vi. 53). Here, beyond all question, is a participation of Christ through or by external things which were not themselves the objects which they represented. Precisely the same assertion can be made with equal truth respecting the consecrated symbols in the Lord's Supper. This receives confirma-

tion from the language of Augustine when he remarks, 'If
' then the Apostle Paul . . . could yet preach the Lord Jesus
' Christ, by signifying Him at one time by His tongue, at
' another by letter, at another by the sacrament of His body
' and blood,' &c. (21 18).

13. But Dr Pusey's doctrine that there can be no communion of Christ's body and blood by an image, unless it contains the reality, is by anticipation directly contradicted by the general testimony of the early Fathers, and by Cyril of Jerusalem, one of Dr Pusey's witnesses, in particular. Explaining baptism as an image and imitation, and expressly maintaining that in no respect was it that of which it was the image or imitation, yet by it the communion of Christ's body and blood was realized. He says, 'O strange and inconceivable thing! We did not really die, we were not really buried, we were not really crucified and raised again; but our imitation was in an image, but our salvation in reality. Christ was actually crucified, and actually buried, and truly rose again; and all these things have been vouchsafed to us, that we, by imitation, having *come into the communion* of His sufferings, might gain salvation in reality. . . . Baptism has a *communion* of the real sufferings of Christ in imitation.' (15 9).

14. Baptism then is not literally that which it represents, but in it, when rightly received, there is the communion or fellowship of Christ's death and resurrection. So the consecrated bread and wine in the Lord's Supper do not require to be or to become that which they represent in order to have the communion or fellowship of that which they represent, viz., Christ's body and blood. As in baptism so here holy signs or symbols may be and are to the devout communicant, the medium of communion or fellowship.

15. It is most unwarrantable in Dr Pusey to take one of three parts of St Paul's teaching and so explain or pervert it as to make it contradictory to the other two parts. So did not an able commentator whose commentaries have been ascribed to Jerome and are usually published in his works. On the words, 'Is it not a participation (*participatio*) of the Lord's body,' he remarks. 'So also the bread of idolatry is shown

‘to be a participation (*participatio*) of demons.’ On the words, ‘Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons,’ he explains, ‘Ye cannot be partakers both of God and of ‘demons’ (In 1 Cor. tom. ix. p. 315).

16. If Dr Pusey can take such liberties with St Paul we are not to be surprised if he takes still greater liberties with Chrysostom in endeavouring to maintain his untenable doctrines. To confirm his misinterpretation of St Paul he most unfairly calls in the aid of Chrysostom. He says, ‘“Why,”’ asks S. Chrysostom, ‘“did he not say participation?”’ Because he ‘wished to point out something more to show how great is the ‘conjunction. For we communicate, not by sharing only and ‘partaking, but also by being united. For as the body is ‘united to Christ, so also are we united to Him by this bread’ (35 17). But Chrysostom’s important exposition of the phrase, ‘The communion of the body,’ Dr Pusey has entirely omitted. Chrysostom goes on to explain that believers are that self-same body. So much so, that he considers there is no difference between the thing signified in the consecrated bread and the body of believing communicants, which we shall have occasion to show was the general doctrine of the Fathers and of Augustine in particular (See ch. viii. 84). Thus Chrysostom states, ‘Further, because he said the communion of the body ‘and that which communicates is another thing from that ‘whereof it communicates; even this, which seemeth to be ‘but a small difference, he took away. For having said, “The ‘“communion of the body,” he sought again to express something ‘nearer. Wherefore also he added, “For we being many are ‘“one bread, one body.” For why speak I of communion? saith ‘he, we are that self-same body. For what is the bread? ‘The body of Christ. And what do they become who partake ‘of it? The body of Christ.’ (22 20, 21.) Chrysostom, as well as the Fathers generally, held that before coming to the Lord’s Supper rightly, there must be a previous and real participation of the body of Christ.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TEACHING OF DR HAMILTON, THE LATE BISHOP OF SALISBURY, AND THAT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH ON THE EXCLUSIVE PRIESTHOOD OF BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS, AND THEIR BEING REAL SACRIFICERS IN THE LORD'S SUPPER, SHOWN TO BE CONTRARY TO HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHURCH. A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE PHRASE **TO DO**, AS USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER AND SHOWN TO BE MISINTERPRETED AND MISAPPLIED BY THE BISHOP AND OTHERS, IN WHICH IS POINTED OUT THE UNACCOUNTABLE MISUSE OF CERTAIN TEXTS CITED IN THE ORIGINAL HEBREW, AND AS RENDERED IN THE LXX., LATIN VULGATE, AND ENGLISH VERSION. THE ANALOGOUS USE OF THE PHRASE **TO DO**, BOTH IN THE JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN PASSOVER, CONSIDERED AND POINTED OUT, AND THAT AS THE CHIEF ACTORS IN THE JEWISH PASSOVER WERE NOT NECESSARILY OF THE PRIESTLY ORDER, SO NEITHER WERE THE CHIEF ACTORS IN THE CHRISTIAN PASSOVER NECESSARILY OF THAT ORDER. AS IN THE ONE CASE WHAT WAS DONE WAS IN REMEMBRANCE OF A PAST EVENT, AND NOT A PERPETUATION OR REPETITION OF IT, SO IN THE OTHER THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST OUR PASSOVER LAMB, BY WHOM WE WERE DELIVERED, IS NOT PERPETUATED OR REPEATED, BUT BROUGHT TO REMEMBRANCE. THIS ILLUSTRATED AND CONFIRMED BY PATRISTIC TESTIMONY. CHRIST, SO FAR FROM HAVING ANY EXCLUSIVE PRIESTLY REPRESENTATIVES, HAVING MINISTERED AND ACTED AS A PRIEST ONCE FOR ALL, HAS SAT DOWN, THEREBY SHOWING THAT THE OFFICE HAS BEEN FULFILLED AND THEREFORE CAN NEED NO REPRESENTATIVES, SHOWN TO BE THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE AND THAT OF THE EARLY CHURCH. CHRIST IS NOT NOW TAKING AWAY, OR BEARING SIN AS ALLEGED; THIS, ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE AND EARLY ANTIQUITY, WAS ACCOMPLISHED WHEN HE SUFFERED ON THE CROSS, AND CAN NEITHER BE CONTINUED NOR REPEATED.

1. IN this chapter we must partially leave Dr Pusey and turn to Dr Hamilton, the late Bishop of Salisbury, who has treated upon the real sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper more fully than Dr Pusey, and in stating and vindicating his own views has substantially represented those of the Roman Church as may be seen on reference to 38 1-14. Of the strong and sincere belief of his own teaching on the Lord's Supper there can be no question. This is attested in the fact that, as a dying man, he avowed it in his profession of faith. He maintains that the apostles and their successors received in a very special and peculiar way from the One Priest special powers of sacrificing. (38 1.) This too is the declared opinion of the

Roman Church. (38 2-4.) The text on which the bishop grounds his belief that bishops and presbyters are invested with the high priesthood of Jesus Christ is, 'Do this in remembrance of me' (38 3, 5); and Roman Catholics denounce those as accursed who deny it. (38 6.) Mr Shipley teaches exactly the same doctrine. (39 4, 5, 16.) But how could any one conceive, least of all a bishop of the English Reformed Church, that when Christ uttered those words He thereby intended to invest exclusively His apostles and their successors with His High Priesthood? The bishop, however, having conceived it, undertakes the task of philologically proving it. We are then told that 'the original words, of which "Do this" is the translation, 'mean in Alexandrian Greek "sacrifice this"'' (38 17); and to prove to his own satisfaction that the phrase has that meaning, out of the 2500 instances where it occurs in the Greek version he gives 65, where it is connected with propitiatory bloody victims for offerings, such as *to do* the bullock, *to do* the lamb, *to do* the whole burnt offerings, which in fact means to prepare the victims, slay them, in short, to do all that was commanded to be done to them in the Levitical law. These five dozen and five texts are elaborately tabulated, and the utmost skill of the Salisbury printer has been called into requisition to produce the desired effect. The references to texts are given in the first column, the renderings of the LXX. in the Greek are placed in the second, the renderings of the Latin Vulgate in the third, and the translation of the Hebrew original in English in the fourth column. None of these are Eucharistic offerings or sacrifices, but propitiatory ones and whole burnt offerings, such as could not be partaken of by the sacrificers or offerers, and it is difficult to conceive why they have been so conspicuously displayed. All of these were slain victims, and, of course, bloody. But the sacrifice, even of the Roman altar, is neither a slain sacrifice nor a bloody one. (38 4.)

2. The evidence, however, does not end here; these displayed texts are intended as a stepping-stone to another class, which are tabulated after the same manner, where the famous Greek word *ποιεῖν* (*to do*) is exhibited in eleven texts connected with unbloody sacrifices, as the bishop supposed, but herein he was egregiously mistaken. (38 18.) We are now coming upon

such a series of blunders as perhaps was never equalled, certainly never surpassed, by any dignitary of the 19th century. We shall take the first four, which may serve as a sample of the other seven. The object of the bishop is to show that the Hebrew word עָשָׂה (*to do*) is translated into the Greek by the word ποιεῖν (*to do*), and that in the LXX. this latter word is used in the sense of *to sacrifice*, or offer unbloody sacrifices. But we shall find that in fact it is not so used.

3. The first text given is Ex. xxix. 41, and the extract from the LXX. which translated into English as it stands separated from the context, may mean ‘thou shalt *do*,’ that is, ‘*sacrifice*’ ‘an offering.’ (38 18.) But this offering, we shall see from the context, is a bloody and not an unbloody offering, and therefore not a case in point. In the Latin Vulgate the word is represented as omitted, and the word *do* is given as representing the English version. The texts of these versions here follow in full, including the original words as quoted by the bishop from the Greek and the Latin, beginning with the English version first, ‘And the other lamb thou shalt offer at even, and shalt *do*’ ‘thereto according to the meat offering of the morning and’ ‘according to the drink offering thereof, for a sweet savour, an’ ‘offering made by fire unto the Lord.’ The term *do* is the one tabulated in this version by the bishop, but it does nothing for him. The translation of the Latin Vulgate is, ‘And the’ ‘other lamb thou shalt offer in the evening according to the’ ‘rite of the morning.’ How little Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate, thought of the word in question, is plain from the fact that he has omitted it, and, like the LXX., as we shall see he has expressed the sense of the original without it. The translation of the Greek version is, ‘And thou shalt offer the’ ‘second lamb in the evening after the manner of the morning’ ‘offering and according to the drink offering of it, thou *shalt*’ ‘offer (ποιήσεις) it *an offering* (καρπωμα) to the Lord for a sweet’ ‘smelling savour.’ As in the Latin, so here, the word in question is omitted, but the same sense is expressed without it. The word does occur at the close of the verse, but not in the sense of *to do* or *offer* an unbloody, but a bloody offering; and, in fact, the bishop has so tabulated it in the list of texts relating to the offering of bloody sacrifices. So this poor little

drudge, used for so many different purposes, is apparently made to perform an impossible task.

4. The second text is Lev. ii. 7. (38 18.) The Greek words, given by the bishop when separated from the context, mean 'fine flour shall be *done*,' that is, 'offered,' but taken as they stand in the text, that is not their meaning. The Latin words he gives are '*fuert sacrificium*,' but it will be seen that these words in no sense represent that for which they are quoted. The English text in full is, 'And if thy oblation be 'a meat offering baken in the frying-pan, it shall be *made* of 'fine flour with oil.' The Latin is, 'And if the sacrifice be '*(fuert sacrificium)* from the gridiron, in like manner the 'flour *shall be tempered (conspersetur)* with oil.' The Greek version is, 'And if thy gift be a sacrifice from the hearth fine 'flour shall be prepared (*σεμιδαλιν ποιηθήσεται*) with oil.' Here again the English version is against the bishop: the Latin version, as tabulated by him, speaks of a sacrifice, but as may be seen, he has quoted the wrong part of the verse, and the part he ought to have quoted, viz., *shall be tempered*, is against him. In the Greek version, the word in question does not denote the offering of fine flour, but the preparing of it.

5. The third text is Lev. ii. 8. (38 18.) Here for the Greek he gives the same words as in Lev. ii. 7 above quoted, but the sentence is not to be found. The English text is, 'And thou shalt bring the meat offering that is *made* of 'these things.' The Latin, 'And when thou offerest (*offerens*) 'it to the Lord thou shalt deliver it into the hands of the priest.' The Greek, 'And he shall offer the sacrifice which he shall 'make of these.' The English version is still against the bishop—he has tabulated the wrong word in the Latin, and the one he wanted is not there to be found. One of the required words is found in the Greek, but not in the sense of *offering* but of *making*.

6. The fourth text is Lev. ii. 11. What he has tabulated from the Greek (38 18), apart from the context, means, 'Ye shall not sacrifice leaven,' but we shall see this is not its meaning when taken with the context. The English text is, 'No meat offering which ye shall bring unto the Lord *shall be* 'made with leaven.' The Latin, '*Shall be made (fiat)* without

'leaven. The Greek, 'Ye *shall* not *make* of *leaven* any sacrifice.' What a series of Episcopal mistakes! In no one of the four texts, or in any one of the three versions of them, is there any evidence to favour the purpose for which the bishop tabulated and displayed them, and had he given the texts in full, each text in each version would have been seen to be against and not for him. The other seven texts which he tabulates after the same manner will be found. (38 19.)

7. Mr Cobb in his 'kiss of Peace' holds with the Bishop, that the phrase, 'do this,' in the institution of the Lord's Supper means offer 'this sacrifice;' and in order that his readers may have proof of this he states, 'I would beg the reader to refer to the very complete table of this use of the word ποιῆν [to do], given in the appendix to the recently published 'charge of the Bishop of Salisbury.' Pt. I., p. 32. It would be interesting to know how he assured himself of the completeness of the table to which he refers his readers with such confidence.

8. The Hebrew word and its Greek equivalent well rendered in English by the word *to do*, are dependent for their meaning upon the connection in which they occur, and are used to express a multitude of acts. Does the bishop inform us that the word *do* in Alexandrian Greek means *to sacrifice* (38 17.) Be it so, and both it and the Hebrew word, of which it is the common translation, mean to *do* or *get* souls (Gen. xii. 5), to *do* or *dress* a calf (xviii. 8), to *do* or *prepare* bread (xxvii. 17), to *do* or *deal* kindly (xlvii. 29), to *do* or to *sacrifice* unto the Lord (Ex. x. 25), to *do* or *pare* the nails (Deut. xxi. 12), to *do* or *dress* the feet, to *do* or *trim* the beard (2 Sam. xix. 24), to *do* or *shew* kindness (1 Chron. xix. 2). The Hebrew word and its Greek equivalent are in the English version rendered by about sixty different words, and they are variously translated so as to express the different acts in relation to the terms with which they stand connected.

9. The Bishop after having tabulated the texts which he considered were favourable to his doctrine of a clerical sacrificing priesthood, huddled together a few others, which he prefaced by this statement: 'The following are some of the many passages where the word ποιῆν (*to do*) is used of keeping the

'Passover.' Had he tabulated and displayed these texts instead of the others, he might have led his readers to a right conclusion. What the Bishop omitted to do will now be done. Instead, then, of beginning with the Greek word *ποιεῖν* (*to do*) in the sense used in his tabulated texts, viz. as expressing exclusive priestly acts, such as offering bloody atoning victims, no part of which was partaken of, we shall begin with *ποιεῖν* (*to do*) in the sense used in the texts alluded to, but of which he made no application, viz. as expressing the act of *doing* or *keeping* the Passover. Our argument, then, expressed in the Bishop's form is, '“Do this in remembrance of me.” *ποιεῖν* (*to do*) in Alexandrian Greek often means *to do*, that is, *to keep* or observe the Passover.' It is so used thirty-seven times in the Old Testament, and a dozen times in connection with *doing* or *keeping* other feasts, and, what is still more important, the word is twice so used in the New Testament; once in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 28), and once by our blessed Lord, thus: 'I do,' that is, 'I keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples' (Matt. xxvi. 18). What was most defective in the texts displayed by the Bishop was, that the doers, the thing done, and the purpose for which it was done, were essentially different, from the doers, the thing done, and the purpose for which it was done, when our Lord commanded His disciples in these words: 'Do this in remembrance of me.' These are very important points which we shall do well to examine. It is interesting to enquire whether the context where *ποιεῖν* (*to do*) stands connected with doing, that is, keeping the Passover, is in agreement with what our Lord said to His disciples, 'Do,' that is, 'keep this in remembrance of me.' We should note well under what circumstances our Lord uttered these words. St. Paul says, 'Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast,' &c. (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). We have, then, a Christian Passover and a feast to keep, in connection with it. When and by whom was it instituted? The certain answer is by our Lord, when He said, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' St. Matthew and St. Mark do not give these words; St. Luke does. The old Passover, as the fathers call it, our Lord *did*, that is, kept (Matt. xxvi. 18). St. Luke more

especially gives the rites relating to the old Passover, some of which were repeated in the new Passover (xxii. 13-18). But for what purpose did the ancient Jews and our Lord with His disciples *do*, that is, keep the old Passover? Moses the servant of God shall answer, 'And Moses said 'unto the people, Remember this day . . . and it shall be 'when the Lord shall bring thee into the land . . . that 'thou shalt "*do*" (*ποιήσεις*), that is "keep," this service, and 'it shall be for a memorial . . . thou shalt therefore keep 'the ordinance" (Ex. xiii. 3-10). Again, Moses said, 'Let the 'children of Israel *do*,' that is, 'keep the Passover' (Num. ix. 2). St. Luke describes our divine lawgiver, after performing the rites of the old Passover, as instituting the new Passover by the words '*Do*,' that is, 'keep this in remembrance of me.'

10. Chrysostom on these words has well remarked, 'Seest 'thou how he removes and draws them off from Jewish 'customs? For like as ye *did that*, He saith, in remembrance of the miracles in Egypt, so *do this* likewise in remembrance of me.' 'What then must we observe that 'other ancient rite also? Some one may say. By no means. 'For on this account, He said "Do this," that He might 'withdraw them from the other.' (22 6, 7.) Bede and Rabanus Maurus have spoken to the same effect, 'When the solemnities of the old Passover were ended, which were done in 'commemoration of the ancient deliverance from Egypt, He 'passed to the new Passover which the Church desires to 'celebrate, in memory of her redemption, That is to say, for 'the flesh or blood of the lamb, substituting a sacrament of 'His flesh and blood in the figure of bread and wine.' (24 4; 26 9).

11. We may justly conclude that the Greek word in question, as used in connection with the doing, that is, the keeping of the Passover, is the exact sense in which our Lord uses it when He said, '*Do*,' that is, 'Keep this in remembrance of me.' But if so, we are sure when our Lord said to his disciples, '*Do this*,' &c., He neither acted as High Priest, nor commissioned them to act in His place as priests, nor in any way to act as sacrificers different from any of the disciples of Christ. There is, as we have noticed, a parallel be-

tween the old and the new Passover, between the type and the antitype, and the word '*to do*' being the same in meaning in the type as in the antitype, it belongs exclusively to persons, acts, and objects connected with the feast of the Passover, and must not be confounded with the exclusive office of the Jewish priesthood, whether it be that of the High Priest or of the priest. The Bishop most unwarrantably confounds the passover rites, not necessarily confined to the priesthood, with the rites peculiar to the priesthood itself. He says, 'So too they who, in obedience to His charge, "Do " "this in remembrance of me," ever commemorate His death 'and sacrifice in the breaking of bread, do thus act as priests, 'and exhibit in their celebrations of the Eucharist their delegation to the duties and the dignities and the ministrations 'of the priesthood of Jesus Christ.' (38 5.) But our Lord in the old passover acted as a private Jew, and with other private Jews *did*, that is, kept it. Our Lord, however, in the new passover acted as the Divine Lawgiver, and appointed the Christian passover to be *done*, that is, kept, in the place of the Jewish. To suppose, as the Bishop does, that He had any successors in this respect is preposterous. (38 1). The parallel to this act, in the type, is not the Jewish High Priest, but Moses; he, as a servant, instituted the commemoration of the passover before the event to be commemorated had taken place, saying: 'And this day shall be unto you a 'memorial, and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord.' (Ex. xii. 14). Moses in the type, had no successor; the one appointment served for the Jewish dispensation. So in the antitype the Lord of Moses re-instituted the ordinance in commemoration of the sacrifice of Himself, and that appointment, according to the Apostle Paul, is to serve to the close of the Christian dispensation (1 Cor. xi. 23, 26). Our Lord, then, has no successor.

12. Again, in the type those who *did* or kept the feast were not exclusively priests: the ordinance was kept before the Jewish priesthood was instituted. Heads of households performed the chief part of the ceremonial as representing their several households. (Ex. xii. 46). The practice was not changed after the appointment of the priesthood. (2 Chron.

xxx. 17). Our blessed Lord, who graciously condescended to fulfil all righteousness, *did* or kept the Jewish passover *with* His disciples. (Matt. xxvi. 18). The Christian passover, however, He did not so much celebrate *with* His disciples as institute it *for* them and all believers to the end of time. The Bishop has not ventured to adduce any instance in apostolic practice where a class of men act as priests in the Lord's Supper, as being exclusive and distinct from the faithful. Perhaps there is only one instance in the New Testament, where, if anywhere, the Bishop's notion of an exclusive priesthood in the Lord's Supper might be expected to have some sanction if true. The apostle alluding to what we now commonly name in the Lord's Supper, the act of consecration, says, 'The cup of blessing which *we* bless.' (1 Cor. x. 16). If it were a fact as the Bishop and his Roman Catholic brethren believe, that when Christ said, 'Do this in remembrance of me, He thereby constituted his apostles and their successors real sacrificing priests (38 5-7), the language of the apostle is unaccountable, for he evidently included with himself the members of the Church at Corinth, as consecrators of the elements of the Lord's Supper, 'The cup of 'blessing which *we* bless.' 'The bread which *we* break.' 'For *we* being many are one bread.' The act of blessing God or giving thanks to Him in the Jewish passover did not belong exclusively to the one who presided. It evidently did not as we should infer, and as the apostle Paul teaches, belong to the one who presided in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Who are the most significant actors in this solemn and interesting feast? Not necessarily the one who presides, even though he be an apostle. For St Paul says, 'As often 'as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's 'death till he come.' (1 Cor. xi. 26). This was the way in which devout communicants fulfilled our Lord's command, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' This is alike the honour and blessedness of every communicant at the Lord's table, and what is *done* in remembrance is as really done by every true believer as by him who presides. It should be noticed that a Jewish household, with its elder in the Jewish passover, found its correspondence in the Christian passover in primi-

tive times, in the individual Church or congregation, with its plurality of elders, the leading one of whom presided.

13. One of the Bishop's antecessors in the diocese of Salisbury, the famous Jewel, 300 years ago, asked the Roman Catholics of his day, 'What father or doctor ever taught that '*hoc facite*' (*do this*), was '*hoc sacrificate*,' (*sacrifice this*)?' (vol. I. p. 990), the question is still unanswered, for his successor, the late Bishop, does not appear to have concerned himself with ancient Fathers and Doctors (though he maintained in his last moments that his doctrine was that of the ancient Church), but has tried to give an answer from Alexandrian Greek, and has made a mull of it. Jewel, on this point, has, by anticipation answered his unworthy successor. He states—

'Neither did Christ by these words, "Do this in my remembrance," erect a new succession of sacrificers, to offer Him up really unto His Father; nor ever did any ancient learned father so expound it. Christ's meaning is clear by the words that follow. For he saith not only "Do ye this;" but he addeth also, "in my remembrance;" which doing pertaineth not only unto the apostles and their successors, as M. Harding [and the late Bishop of Salisbury] imagineth, but also to the whole people. And therefore St Paul saith not only to the ministers, but also to the whole congregation of Corinth, "as often as ye shall eat this bread and drink this cup, ye shall show forth and publish the Lord's death till he come." (1 Cor. xi. 26). Likewise, St Chrysostom applieth the same, not only to the clergy, but also to the whole people of his church of Antioch. Thus he saith, "Do ye this in remembrance of my benefit and of your salvation." (Vol. I. p. 715.)

14. The fathers commonly understood our Lord's words, 'Do this,' as addressed to all believers. Thus Justin Martyr a layman says, 'The bread which our Christ gave us to do in remembrance of His being made flesh in behalf of those who believe in Him.' (7 3, see also sec. 5.)

15. Chrysostom on the same words remarks, 'Art thou doing a remembrance of Christ and despisest thou the poor, and tremblest not? Why if a son or a brother, had died, and thou wert doing a remembrance of Him, thou wouldest have been smitten by thy conscience, hadst thou not fulfilled the custom and invited the poor, and when thou art doing a remembrance of thy Master,' &c. (22 23). Chrysostom evi-

dently applied the words to the communicants of his congregation. Theophylact a Greek father who lived in the eleventh century, although probably a believer in the doctrine of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements, so interpreted the words 'do this,' as to make them equally applicable to all communicants, he says, 'If thou *doest* a remembrance of a son 'or of a father, thou art smitten in thy conscience, unless thou 'performest all the rites, and invitest the poor; but *doing* a 'remembrance of the Lord thou sharest not unfeignedly thy 'table.' (In 1 Cor., tom. ii, p. 258).

16. The chief act in the Lord's Supper is the consecration of the elements, which, according to the general teaching of the fathers, was principally effected by giving of thanks, and, as explained by them, was performed by all the communicants who might be present. Thus Augustine, explaining the order of the Sacrament to the newly baptized, shows that the *sursum corda*, and the act of thanksgiving (which with him was the consecration act) were done by the whole congregation (21 126).

17. Chrysostom is still more to the point. Thus in addressing the communicants he said, 'There were occasions in 'which there was no difference at all between the priest and 'those under him; for instance, when we are to partake of 'the awful mysteries. . . . For in the most awful mysteries 'themselves the priest prays for the people, and the people 'pray for the priest, for the words, "with Thy Spirit," are 'nothing else than this. The offering of thanksgiving, again, 'is common, for neither doth he give thanks alone, but also 'all the people. For having first taken their voices, next 'when they assent that it is "meet and right so to do," then 'he begins the thanksgiving.' He concludes by remarking, 'Now I have said this, in order that each one of the laity 'also may keep his attention awake, that we may understand 'that we are all one body, having such differences amongst 'ourselves, as members with members' (22 25). Elsewhere speaking of the priest in relation to the sacraments he says, 'The priest only performs a symbol,' and goes on to remark, 'I am about to say what may appear strange, but be not 'astonished nor startled at it. The offering is the same, 'whether a common man, or Paul, or Peter offers it' (22 31).

18. As late as the eleventh century, in a Homily ascribed to Bernard, and published in his works, we have this statement, 'as if only the priest consecrated or sacrificed the body of Christ. It is not he alone who sacrifices, it is not he alone who consecrates, but the whole congregation of the faithful which is present consecrate with him, sacrifice with him.' (*Serm. in die Puri. tom. ii. f. 257.*)

19. It is only by confounding the rites of the Passover with those of the great Day of Atonement that the Bishop can give any seeming evidence of there being a proper sacrifice, priest, and altar in the Lord's Supper. See these statements 38, 17, 20, 21.

20. From this we cannot learn whether the Bishop means Christ's sacrifice, under the aspect of the antitype of the Paschal sacrifice, or that of the sin offering. These two aspects must have a separate and distinct consideration; but we shall find that in neither aspect in the antitype was the sacrifice continuous.

21. We begin first with the Passover. Up to the time our Lord instituted His own Passover, the Israelites did, kept, or sacrificed, the Passover in remembrance of the sparing or passing over the houses of Israel, sprinkled with the blood of the first or original paschal lamb. But that was neither repeated nor continued. The lambs of the first Passover in Egypt were sacrifices in a sense in which those subsequent Passovers were not. The blood sprinkled on the door posts had an efficacy which could not be ascribed to subsequent Passovers. It is true, as we shall notice immediately, that paschal lambs were sacrificed but only as memorials (Ex. xiii. 8-10). The antitype, 'Christ, our Passover, *was sacrificed* (*ἐρῴθη*) for us' (1 Cor. v. 7). This is an event absolutely past, and it is truly shocking to conceive of it as being either repeated or continued. We keep the feast as St Paul says, but as in the Jewish so in ours, the sacrifice is not continued, but kept in memory by memorials.

22. We have already seen the connection there is between the word *to do* in the Jewish Passover, and the word *to do* in the Christian Passover; but the extent of the signification of the word has to be determined by what in either case had

been appointed to be done. On examination, then, it will be found that there were many things apparently of a sacrificial nature in the Jewish rite, to which there is no correspondence in the Christian rite. The word 'sacrifice,' or to 'sacrifice,' in relation to the Jewish Passover, is of very definite import, and of necessity inapplicable to the Lord's Supper. The parallel to the sacrifice or slain lamb of the Jewish Passover in the Lord's Supper are bread and wine, and therefore not capable of being sacrificed in any proper sense. *To do*, the Jewish Passover, may mean to sacrifice or slay the Passover. It certainly includes that meaning. We have only four instances, however, where the word 'to sacrifice' (זָבַח) is so applied, and they all occur in Deuteronomy xvi. 1-6. The word 'sacrifice' is but seldom connected with the Passover. The following are the chief instances, Exodus xii. 27 ; xxiii. 18 ; and xxxiv. 25. The last text taken with the context, and compared with Exodus xii. 10, and Numbers ix. 12, shows that the sacrifice is a slain victim, and is called a sacrifice from that circumstance. It is certain that in all these instances the Hebrew verb and noun must be understood in their literal sense, viz. the slaying of a victim or one slain. The word in this connection is never used of the priest's slaying victims in sacrifice ; but of private persons offering sacrifices at their own cost. This is an additional proof to those previously given that the celebrators of the Jewish Passover were not necessarily of the consecrated priesthood. The eucharistic lamb of the Jewish Passover being substituted in the Christian Passover by eucharistic elements of bread and wine, has of necessity done away with sacrifice in the sense applied to the lamb, and has also done away with the offering itself, for the lamb only constituted the offering in the Jewish Passover. As the history of these offerings is very brief, the whole shall be stated. In 2 Chron. xxxv. 7-9, according to our version, we have the phrase Passover offerings occurring three times. But in the original in each case the word is simply Passovers, meaning of course paschal lambs, which no doubt were given to be offered, and, therefore, might properly be called offerings. The same word in another place is translated Passovers (2 Chron xxx. 17). There are, however, two distinct in-

stances where the paschal victim is called an offering or a gift (Num. ix. 7, 13). The offerer in this case, as in other important parts of the paschal rites, was not one of the consecrated order of priests. This sacrifice was of most solemn import, and in both these instances is called the offering or gift of the Lord, meaning it was the Lord's gift, as elsewhere it is thrice called 'my sacrifice' (Ex. xxiii. 18, and xxxiv. 25). In the second instance of the first text it should be translated 'my feast.' If it is asked why the Lord called it 'my sacrifice,' 'my feast,' or why is it called 'the offering,' or 'gift of the Lord,' the answer is, because it was to be killed, and its blood sprinkled, which shows it to be a proper sacrifice, and then eaten by God's command, in grateful remembrance of an exceeding great benefit; and in this respect it was a eucharistic sacrifice. But what is here affirmed of the paschal lamb as an offering and a sacrifice in the type, assuredly cannot be affirmed of the elements of bread and wine in the antitype.

23. The next point to be noticed is the altar. In the Jewish Passover, the sacrifice being eucharistic and wholly eaten by those who presented the offering, the only use for the altar would be for the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice at or near it. In the first Jewish Passover it does not appear that there was any actual altar. The blood of the first paschal offerings was sprinkled 'on the two side posts, and on 'the upper door post of the houses' (Ex. xii. 7). We have before said that this Passover was never repeated or continued, but all succeeding Passovers were commemorative of it. The sprinkling of blood still continued to be a part of the Passover ceremonial, and this act was performed by a consecrated priest (2 Chr. xxx. 16, and xxxv. 11). It is not said where they sprinkled the blood, but, from the context and general practice, we may be certain that it was sprinkled on or near the altar. There is no parallel to this in the Christian Passover. There is no blood to sprinkle, and no altar on which to sprinkle it. It should be observed that the slaying of the paschal lamb and the sprinkling of its blood on or near the altar, whilst it was commemorative of the past, was also chiefly typical of the future. This solemn offering, as we have above noticed, is spoken of as 'the blood of my sacrifice' as the 'offering' or 'gift (*corban*) of

‘Jehovah’ (Ex. xxiii. 18, and xxxiv. 25; Num. ix. 7, 13). The antitype of this sacrifice or gift must be the actual sacrifice or gift of Christ, and the sprinkling of His blood; in other words, the pleading of His sacrifice. Christ our Passover has been sacrificed (1 Cor. v. 7), and His blood has been sprinkled (Heb. ix. 12). These acts, of course, in the Lord’s Supper cannot be continued, perpetuated, or repeated. The cross was the altar on which Christ was sacrificed, and the act of sprinkling was performed by Christ Himself after He had entered heaven. That part, then, of the Jewish Passover may be considered to have been fully accomplished in Christ the Antitype; consequently in the Christian Passover there is no victim to sacrifice, no blood to be sprinkled, and no altar on which to sprinkle it. Be it remembered that the table on which were placed the paschal elements, and from which the guests partook of the feast, only remains in the antitype, but the altar and all its correlatives have ceased.

24. We have now to consider the second point, viz., the great day of atonement in its type and antitype. What concerns the Passover we have fully considered, and proved that in its rites there was nothing exclusively priestly, least of all any peculiar acts of the high priest, whether as relates to the type or the antitype. It is a most outrageous application of Holy Scripture to make those interesting words, ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ the medium of delegating ‘the Great High Priesthood’ of Jesus Christ to a particular class of disciples (38 3, 5; 39 4, 5, 16), and to no others. The words have been shown to apply to all believing communicants. The bishop and Mr Shipley would confine them exclusively to canonically ordained bishops and priests, including all those of the Roman and Greek Churches with which the bishop and his brethren sigh to be in visible communion. The notion of the office of ‘the Great High Priesthood’ of Christ being divided amongst many thousands of men seems to partake of irreverence. The acts peculiar to the office of the high priest were of a very solemn nature, and could only be performed by one person at a time. His peculiar functions in relation to the day of atonement were exercised only once a year, and performed in a definite and short period of time. What he

did at that time might be considered as complete for the year, and was not to be continued or repeated during that period under pain of death (Lev. xvi. 2). The bishop represents the sacrifice of Christ as 'ever living and continuous' (38 20). Mr Shipley also holds this very extraordinary doctrine. He says, 'The force of the command, "Do this," authorised the 'apostles and their successors in the priesthood to continue 'that sacrifice till His coming again' (39 16). In the type the sacrifice was partly continuous; for although the sacrifice was offered only once in the year, and that for the whole year, yet being performed annually, it was repeated, and, in that sense, continued. The Scriptures speak of it in this light: 'For the law having a shadow of good things to come, 'and not the very image of the things, can never, with those 'sacrifices which they offered year by year *continually*, make 'the comers thereunto perfect' (Heb. x. 1). This was the way in which matters stood in the time of the shadow; but how is it now that the good things have come? Let the contrast be noticed. 'But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice 'for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God. . . . For 'by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are 'sanctified' (Heb. x. 12-14). What was done in the type every year could not make the comers thereunto perfect; there was a remembrance of sins every year. 'For it is not 'possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away 'sins' (Heb. x. 4). But in the antitype the Lord Jesus offered one sacrifice for sins, not expecting, as in the type, to be called upon to repeat or continue the same thing: He for ever sat down. In the type the act sufficed only for the year; but in the antitype, 'by one offering He hath for ever 'perfected them that are sanctified.' The Bishop tells us, 'that if we now look within the veil of the sanctuary, we may 'discern, with the eye and the ear of faith, our Lord's perpetual ministrations' (*Charge* 1867, p. 34). Mr Shipley states: 'In order, therefore, to bring the Eucharistic sacrifice 'into connection with that which the great High Priest is 'offering above, there must be the interposition of one commissioned by Him to perform that high function' (39 4). The Bishop does not inform us where faith, through its eye

and ear, gets its object ; viz., our Lord's perpetual ministrations within the veil. Nor does Mr Shipley help us : he affirms that 'the Great High Priest is offering above,' but does not inform us where he got the information. Have these gentlemen seen it in the Roman missal, or heard of it in the Roman mass ? It certainly is no object of faith in the Holy Scriptures, for we there read, 'But by His own blood He entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption for us' (Heb. ix. 12). In the type the Jewish high priest was not always ministering within the veil, but once during the year for a short and definite space of time ; and this answered the end designed for the year. Christ, in the antitype, entered, not year by year, but through His own blood entered once for all, and obtained eternal redemption for us. This eternal redemption was obtained once for all ; and having obtained it, He need not be perpetually ministering within the veil.

25. Here we shall anticipate a portion of the testimony of the Fathers on this point. Chrysostom, on Hebrews vii. 27, remarks :—

'When thou hearest that He was a priest, do not think that He is always acting as a priest ; for He acted as Priest once, and then sat down. And lest thou shouldest suppose that He is standing above, and is a minister, the apostle shows that it is a part of the dispensation. For as He was made a servant, so also a Priest and Minister. But as, when He was a servant, He did not remain a servant, so also, when made a minister, He did not remain a minister. For it is not the duty of a servant to sit down, but to stand. This, then, here silently betokens the greatness of the sacrifice, which, being one and offered once, yet did what all other sacrifices could not do.' (22 34).

Rabanus Maurus, on the same verse, repeats the like remarks. (26 14). Again Chrysostom, on the words, 'Who is set on the right hand of God' (Heb. viii. 1), observes : 'Therefore He says, "Sit thou on my right hand," as he who sits is not a minister.' (22 35). He further states, after quoting the words, 'And every priest standeth daily, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices' (Heb. x. 11), 'Therefore, to stand is a sign of ministering ; but to sit, a sign that it is ministered. . . . He, then, remitted those sins when He gave the testa-

ment; and He gave this testament through the sacrifice of Himself. If, therefore, He remitted those sins by that sacrifice, there was no need of a second.' (22 38).

26. Other Fathers, not cited in our *catena*, reiterate the same sentiments in still plainer language, manifestly showing that so far from believing that Christ, as High Priest, had any representative sacrificers, in any proper sense, He Himself, having ministered and sacrificed once for all, had sat down; and, therefore, as He had ceased to perform the functions of a priest, could need no one to represent Him in that capacity. Thus, Œcumenius, a Greek Father of the 10th century, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the words, 'For this He did once' (Heb. vii. 27), remarks: '*This*, what? That He offered Himself a sacrifice 'for the sins of the people; for, on His own behalf, he did 'not do this once. For it was not necessary that He should 'offer on His own behalf, since He could not sin. Do not, 'therefore, when thou hearest that He was High Priest, think 'that He is always performing the functions of a priest: for 'having done this once, henceforth He hath sat down on His 'Father's throne. For it is the part of a minister and priest 'to stand; but to sit down signifies, that, having offered a 'sacrifice once, that is, His own body, henceforward He hath 'sat down.' Again, on the words, 'a minister of the sanctuary' (Heb. viii. 2), he states: 'For He is our High Priest. 'But He sits at the right hand of the Father, for it is the 'office of a minister to stand, and to minister; but to sit 'down is the part of God, to whom the service is offered.' Lastly, on the words, 'and every priest standeth' (Heb. x. 11), he says: 'Therefore, to stand is a sign of ministering; but 'to sit down, as Christ sat down, at the right hand of the 'Father, is a sign that he is ministered to, as He who is 'God.'

27. Another Greek Father, who bears the same testimony, is Theophylact, who lived in the 11th century. In his Commentary on the same Epistle, on the words, 'For this He did 'once by offering Himself' (Heb. vii. 27), he asks, 'What is 'this? That He might offer for the sins of the people, not 'for Himself. Once, it is said, He performed the office of a

'priest, but afterwards as Lord He sat down. For do not, when thou hearest that He was a priest, think that He always stands, and is a minister. He shows that, according to the dispensation, He was made a priest; but the dispensation being accomplished, He received again His proper exaltation.' Again, on the words, 'standeth daily ministering' (Heb. x. 11.) he states: 'To stand, then, is the sign of a minister, but to sit down as Christ is the sign of one who has ministered.'

28. The Fathers generally teach very plainly that, in 'doing a remembrance,' the sacrifice of Christ is not continued, as the Bishop and his school would represent, but is brought to mind or commemorated. Justin Martyr states, 'Now, it is evident that in this prophecy (Isa. xxxiii. 13-20) allusion is made to the bread which our Christ gave us *to do in remembrance* of His being made flesh in behalf of those who believe in Him, for whom also He suffered, and to the cup which He gave us *to do in remembrance* of His own blood, with giving of thanks.' (7 3, 5.) Origen states: 'Of what body and of what blood did He, giving the images, both the bread and the cup, enjoin upon the disciples, through them, to do a remembrance of Him.' (11 48.) Cyprian: 'And because we make mention of His passion in all sacrifices (for the passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer), we ought to do nothing else than what He did. For the Scripture says, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." ' (12 8.) Eusebius, after quoting Gal. iii. 13, and 2 Cor. v. 21, says: 'After all things being prepared, He offered a certain wonderful victim and chosen sacrifice, acceptable to the Father, for the salvation of all of us, and directed us to offer continually a memorial to God instead of a sacrifice.' (14 1.) Again: 'When, therefore, we have received that, we ought to celebrate the memory of this sacrifice [that of the cross] on the table, through the symbols of His body and saving blood, according to the laws of the New Testament.' (14 2.) 'Celebrating the memorial of the grand sacrifice by the mysteries (sacraments) which He has ordained, and presenting our thanksgivings for our salvation by devout hymns and prayers.' (14 3.) Basil states: 'What, then, are these words

‘useful for? [The words of institution of the Lord’s Supper.]
‘That, eating and drinking, we always keep in remembrance
‘Him who died for us and rose again, and that we be so
‘necessarily established, to keep before God and His Christ
‘the doctrine given by the apostle. For he who eats and
‘drinks—that is to say, in the indelible remembrance of Jesus
‘Christ our Lord, who died for us, &c.’ (16 4, 5.) What
Jerome or some valuable commentator who has been taken
for him has said may be seen 18 65. Augustine states :
‘Jesus Christ offered Himself a sacrifice for our sins, and
‘commended a resemblance of His sacrifice to be celebrated
‘in memory of His passion.’ (21 25.) ‘Does Christ die as
‘often as the Passover is celebrated? But yet the yearly
‘memorial does, as it were, represent what occurred long
‘since, and causes in us such emotions, as if we saw the Lord
‘hanging on the cross.’ (21 45.) Chrysostom asks : ‘Do not
‘we Christians daily offer? We do offer, but we do a re-
‘membrance of His death. For this is for a remembrance of
‘that which took place then. For He saith, “Do this in re-
‘membrance of me.” We do not make a different, as the
‘high priest did, but always the same sacrifice; or rather, we
‘do a remembrance of that sacrifice.’ (22 36, 37.) Theo-
doret says : ‘If the priest, who is according to the order of
‘Melchizedek, has offered His sacrifice, and has made other
‘sacrifices to be needless, why do the priests of the New
‘Testament perform the mystical (or sacramental) service?
‘It is plain to those who have been instructed in Divine
‘things that we do not offer another sacrifice, but we make
‘the commemoration of that one saving sacrifice. For the
‘Lord Himself commanded us, saying, “Do this in remem-
‘brance of me.” And this we do, in order that, by con-
‘templation, we may call to mind the type of the sufferings
‘which He underwent for us, and may stir up our love toward
‘our Benefactor, and await the fruition of good things to
‘come.’ (23 33.) Sedulius, on 1 Cor. xi. 24, quoting the
words, ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ remarks : ‘He left
‘us His remembrance, just as if one travelling into another
‘country should leave a pledge with him whom he loved, that,
‘whenever he looked upon it, he might call to mind his

'favours and friendship.' (*Bib. Mag. Vet. Patr.*, tom. v. pt. 1. p. 487.) Primacius, on 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26, says: 'God the Saviour hath given us a form, that as often as we *do* this we may retain in our mind that Christ died for us.' (*Ibid.*, tom. vi. pt. 2, p. 61.)

29. Such is a portion of the patristic testimony upon this point. The Bishop and his Roman brethren contend that 'do this' means 'sacrifice this,' and that those who are commissioned to perform our Lord's command as thus understood, 'have received the power of sacrificing in a very special and 'peculiar way,' (38 l.) and that this power of sacrificing in the name and place of Christ is exclusively confined to bishops and presbyters. But these illustrious and ancient Fathers apply the words in question, whatever may be their meaning, to believers generally, as being alike their honour and privilege to obey the command of Christ; and although these Fathers sometimes use sacrificial language in relation to the Lord's Supper, yet when they specially explain what they mean, and speak accurately, so far from considering the phrase 'Do this, &c.' as meaning a command to sacrifice in a very special and peculiar way, that they rather regard it as doing the remembrance of a sacrifice.

30. But the Bishop as we have seen, quotes two texts, one directly and another indirectly, to show that Christ's sacrifice is continuous. One could almost be persuaded that the Bishop did not mean what he said, or that he did not understand his own statement. The word *sacrifice*, in the New Testament is used in two senses:—in its literal and proper signification, as a slain victim for sin, and in a metaphorical sense. In the former sense only is it applied to Christ. It is said, 'He put away sin by the *sacrifice* of Himself.' (Heb. ix. 26.) The Apostle Paul, using the same term in its verbal form, applies it to Christ: thus, 'Christ, our passover *was sacrificed* for us.' (1 Cor. v. 7.) But the words *sacrifice* and *sacrificed* are equivalent to the terms offering and offered, which are also applied to Christ. Thus we read, 'He *had offered* one *sacrifice* for sins.' Again, 'By one *offering* He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' (Heb. x. 14.) But none of these sacrificial terms are applicable to Christ as He now is.

They inform us what He condescended to be and to do for us nearly 2000 years ago. The first text the Bishop quotes in support of Christ's sacrifice being continuous is, 'Lo in the midst of the throne stood a lamb as it had been slain. . . . 'Worthy is the lamb that was slain.' (38 20.) But this is against, not for, the Bishop, for in neither case does it say *being slain*, but *had been* and *was slain*. The other text the Bishop introduces thus—"That takest away the sin of the world," not "that tookest away," but still takest. As then the sacrifice is continuous, its propitiatory virtue is continuous, &c.' (38 21.) Mr Shipley states the point as follows, 'We do not say that He took away the sins of the world at some given moment in the past, and then left men to avail themselves as they could of that atonement. But we say, 'O Lamb of God that takest away the sins of the world.'" (39 17.) These words are taken from Scripture, but are slightly altered so as to adapt them for invocation as in the *Gloria in Excelsis*, from which these men have quoted them. We shall notice the words as they occur in Scripture and as they are used by the Church. The text in the English version is 'Lamb of God, which *taketh away* the sin of the world' (John i. 29.) The full sense is best given thus, 'which *beareth* the punishment of the sin of the world.' These men, by laying so much stress on the present tense, are acting a similar part to that of Dr Pusey, where he takes the words '*is given*,' '*is broken*,' '*is shed*,' as descriptive of continuous acts, that like his brethren he may have some foundation for continuous sacrificing. (See Ch. ii. 10.) John the Baptist did not mean to say that Christ was then actually bearing the punishment of the sin of the world, but that He most certainly would do so very soon, as in fact He did, for it is recorded 'Who His own self *bare* our sins [the punishment of our sins] in His own body on the tree.' (1 Pet. ii. 24.) These men would seem to persuade us that the Lamb of God *hath* not *borne* the punishment of the sin of the world, but still *beareth* it. Can it be believed that Christ is *still bearing* the punishment of the sin of the world? Yet so these men teach. When St. Peter wrote, Christ had borne the punishment of our sins, and he refers to it as a past event, 'who *bare*' or '*bore*.'

31. We have now to enquire whether the early Church in the communion service employed the words in question so as to teach a perpetuated or continuous sacrificial act. To this we answer no; for the words were not used in the early communion service. And here we might dismiss the point, but to show how these men who talk so much about the ancient Church and boast of their regard for antiquity, yet very often take up with novelties or comparatively young inventions, we shall pursue the inquiry a little further, and give the testimony of three more recent authors who have written on the communion service, or, as they call it, the mass, which then was comparatively an inoffensive word, but now its very sound reminds us of a mass or mess of superstition.

32. Amalarius who flourished about the year 800, giving the origin and use of the *Agnus Dei* in his treatise on Church offices says, ‘Pope Sergius appointed the *Agnus Dei* to be sung as it is written in the Pontifical Acts. Here the *Agnus Dei* is appointed to be chanted by the clergy and people at the time of breaking the Lord’s body. It is a prayer for the people, who are about to receive the Lord’s body that by the mercy of the Innocent Lamb, sudden and hasty sins may be taken away, that is to say, of thoughts and words; and as by His passion He *hath taken away* (*tulit*) the offences of the whole world, so now also those of the Church, which is about to receive Him through the Eucharist.’ (*De Eccles. Officiis* lib. iii. cap. 33. *Bib. Mag. Vet. Patr.* tom. ix. pt. 1, p. 359.) Sergius was pope at the end of the 8th century.

33. Alcuin, who lived at the close of the 8th century, in a chapter on the celebration and signification of the mass, says, ‘In the meantime is sung by all, and by singing is prayed, saying “*Lamb of God which takest away the sins of the world,*” and the rest. . . . But how He takes away the sins of the world, John in the Revelation shows, saying, “Who *loved* us, and *washed* us from our sins in His own “blood,” when He *gave* His very blood for us on the cross, or when each of us was washed with the water of baptism in the mystery of that sacred passion. But He also daily takes away the sins of the world, and washes us from our daily

'sins in His own blood, when at the altar the remembrance
'of that same blessed passion is reverted to.' *De Divinis
Officiis*, cap. xl. col. 1123.

34. Remigius, Bishop of Auxerre, who lived nearly a century later than Alcuin, and fifty years after Paschasius introduced his heresy on the Real Presence in his treatise on the Celebration of the Mass, has given the above statement with the following addition: 'But how He takes away the
'sin of the world, the Apostle Peter shows, who says; "Ye
'"were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and
'"gold, &c., but with the precious blood of Christ, as a Lamb
'"without blemish and without spot."' (*Bib. Mag. Vet. Patr.*, tom. ix. pt. ii. p. 548).

35. Rabanus Maurus, who lived about the middle of the 8th century, in his chapter on the Order of the Mass, says:—

'Then the clergy pray by singing "*Lamb of God which takest away
'"the sins of the world, have mercy on us."* We beseech Christ
'Himself, who is the innocent Lamb of God, who *hath suffered* for
'the salvation of the world, to have mercy on us, saying, "Have
'"mercy on us." For a lamb in the Old Testament was offered for
'the sins of the people, and in the New Testament Christ *offered*
'Himself to God the Father, to deliver the human race, by His passion,
'from sin. And therefore the *Lamb of God* is then sung, when the
'Lord's body and blood are received, as we all believe, that the body
'and blood of that Lamb are then received, who by dying *took away*
'(*tulit*) the sins of the world, and by rising gave to us eternal life.'—*De Sac. Ord. Sacra. Div.*, &c., cap. xix. tom. vi. p. 55.

36. Ælfric alludes to the use of the same phrase in the Mass, but not as a proof of Christ's act of sacrificing being continued; for he refers to it as a past event, as that 'through
'which we be delivered from everlasting death.' (27 2.)

37. It is true that both Amalarius, Alcuin, and Remigius employ the phrase *bear or take away sin* loosely, as if it were equivalent to such words as pardon, forgive, and remit. But did they, in relation to the Lord's Supper, use the phrase in question in its strictly atoning and sacrificial sense? Their own statements forbid any such conclusion. Some of the early Fathers use the phrase in the same loose manner. For instance, Chrysostom, dwelling upon the present tense, remarks: 'He said not "Who shall take," or "Who hath

“taken,” but, “Who taketh away the sins of the world ;” ‘as if He were always doing this ; for He did not only take them away when He suffered, but from that time to the present doth He take them away ; not by being always crucified, for He offered one sacrifice for sins, but by that one continually purging them.’—*In Joan Hom.* xviii. tom. viii. p. 94. Notwithstanding the loose way in which he employs the phrase, by the necessary caution he has given, we need not mistake his meaning. Christ once, and once for all, took away, or bore, sin—that is, its punishment by His death ; but according to Chrysostom, He now takes away sin, or rather purges or pardons it, not by a continuance of His death or sacrifice, but by its abiding efficacy.

38. Still more to our point is an ancient proper preface for Easter-day, and which is retained in the Roman Missal, and is given in our Liturgy. In the former it is, ‘*Ipse enim verus est Agnus qui ABSTULIT peccata mundi ;*’ in the latter, which may serve as a translation of the former, it is, ‘For He ‘is the very Lamb which *hath taken away* the sin of the ‘world.’

39. Cyprian, so far from having any conception that Christ in the Lord’s Supper bears or takes away our sins, in his explanation of the sacrament of the cup in regard to its being commemorative of a past event, employs the words, ‘Christ ‘who *bore* our sins.’ (12 6.)

CHAPTER VII.

A FULL ANSWER TO DR WISEMAN'S NOVEL CRITICISM ON JOHN VI. OUR LORD'S TEACHING RESPECTING HIMSELF AS THE BREAD OF LIFE ILLUSTRATED BY OTHER PARTS OF THE SAME GOSPEL. DR WISEMAN'S LEADING OBJECTIONS TO A FIGURATIVE INTERPRETATION OF OUR LORD'S WORDS CONSIDERED AND ANSWERED. THE UNSACRAMENTAL CHARACTER OF THE DISCOURSE DEMONSTRATED. ITS ARBITRARY DIVISION BY DR WISEMAN SHOWN TO BE NOVEL AND UNFOUNDED. HIS RULES OF INTERPRETATION CONSIDERED TO BE INAPPLICABLE AND MISAPPLIED. THE DISCOURSE AND OTHERS IN THE SAME GOSPEL SHOWN TO BE PROPHETIC, AND NOT INTENDED TO BE CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD UNTIL AFTER OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION. THE FOLLY OF DR PUSEY'S ADVICE TO BE CONTENT WITH THE KNOWLEDGE THE DISCIPLES HAD RESPECTING HOW CHRIST'S FLESH WAS TO BE EATEN BEFORE HIS RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION EXHIBITED. HIS AND ARCHDEACON DENISON'S ASSUMPTION CONSIDERED AND ANSWERED; VIZ., THAT OUR LORD'S DISCOURSE WAS ON SACRAMENTALLY EATING HIS FLESH AND BLOOD. THAT THE FLESH AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, ACCORDING TO THE UNDOUBTED TEACHING OF THE EARLY CHURCH, CAN BE RECEIVED OTHERWISE THAN IN THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, AND MUST BE SO RECEIVED BEFORE THEY CAN BE RECEIVED RIGHTLY IN THAT HOLY ORDINANCE. DR WISEMAN'S LITERAL INTERPRETATION OF OUR LORD'S WORDS PROVED TO HAVE BEEN ANSWERED BY ANTICIPATION BY THE UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF ALL ANTIQUITY.

1. THE latter part of the sixth chapter of the gospel of St John is usually adduced by Romanists and Romanizers, as teaching the doctrine of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper. Dr Pusey, as we shall see, assumes that it does, but makes no attempt at proof. Here, and elsewhere, in order to examine and discuss the whole argument for the Roman doctrine on the Real Presence, we have to leave the fragmentary writings of Dr Pusey on the Eucharist, and supply their lack from other sources. We find it supplied in the writings of Dr Wiseman, whose arguments on the subject of this chapter we shall have more especially to examine.

2. It was a common practice with our blessed Lord, to avail Himself of the various incidents and events which were continually arising in His intercourse with men, to speak of Himself and of the spiritual kingdom which He was about to

establish on earth, so as to excite attention and arouse the expectations of His hearers, especially of His disciples. Our Lord's discourses or remarks on these occasions were very striking and impressive, although, for the most part, veiled in parable, shrouded in prophetic garb, and were not fully understood, and perhaps not intended to be until they were fulfilled. This gospel of St John affords several examples, some of which we shall do well to consider.

3. Nicodemus came to inquire of our Lord respecting what at that time he considered would be an earthly kingdom, and concerning which he and his fellow rulers were very anxious. He fully admitted the divine mission of Christ as a teacher. Christ anticipating his inquiries, at once commenced to instruct him to some extent in the nature of the kingdom of God. (John iii. 1-3.) The Rabbi marvelled that a new birth was required to see what he considered to be an earthly kingdom, and with this idea, naturally enough, he asked how a man can be born when he is old ? (v. 4.) Our Lord answered so as to convince him that He spoke of a spiritual and not of a natural birth. Nicodemus then inquired how can these things be ? (v. 9.) He marvelled not so much respecting this spiritual change, for our Lord no doubt used language and sentiments perfectly familiar to a learned Jewish Rabbi, but that this was a prerequisite for an earthly kingdom. Our Lord then discoursed to him on the gospel of the kingdom, especially dwelling upon His own sufferings and death, and upon Himself as God's great gift for that purpose. It is scarcely needful to remark that this discourse was not fully understood until the events narrated in it were accomplished. Our Lord, then, in this case, directed the mind of Nicodemus from an earthly literal kingdom, which he, in common with Christ's disciples, erroneously expected, to a spiritual one, but as real to the perception and enjoyment of the inner man—for the kingdom of God is within men—as a well regulated and prosperous earthly kingdom is to the outer man.

4. Our Lord's discourse with the woman of Samaria is another example. From spring water, called, after the manner of the Hebrew, living water, He directed her attention to the living water which He Himself would give, but the nature of

the gift and the time of giving it, were then, as we know, matters of the future. It should be observed that this water is not to be taken literally, but figuratively and spiritually, and the gift represented thereby may be as really received by the thirsty soul as water by the thirsty body. (John iv. 7-30.)

5. A third instance, is one in which our Lord restored a man who had been infirm for thirty-eight years, and from this he proceeded to speak of spiritual restoration, which like the other blessings to which we have just alluded, was a matter of the future, and only to be fully understood when it took place. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live.' (John v. 5-25.) The one was a physical restoration, the other a spiritual resuscitation, but the latter as real to the soul as the former to the body.

6. A fourth instance is still more striking. Our Lord at the feast of tabernacles, probably after those words the Jews were wont to sing at an important part of the ceremonial, 'With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation,' said, 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' (John vii. 37, 38.) It is not to be conceived that these words could be taken literally. They are, in fact, highly figurative, and when uttered, were prophetic and obscure. Of this we are certain, from the fact that St John, who wrote his gospel long after their fulfilment, tells us, 'But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on Him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.' (v. 39.) This prophecy had its accomplishment more especially in the holy apostles who were spiritual fountains as really to thirsty souls as were the twelve fountains in Elim to the thirsty Israelites.

7. The last instance, and for which the others have been adduced as illustrative, is the most striking and interesting of all, and is that which we have now more especially to examine and consider. Our Lord had fed a multitude of about five thousand with five barley loaves and two small fishes. As some of those who had thus been fed, evinced more solicitude

respecting food for the body than food for the soul, our Lord exhorted them to strive more after imperishable than perishable food, and revealed Himself as the Divine One who would bestow everlasting life (John vi. 27.) This was the occasion of an interesting dialogue in which the people spoke of their fathers eating manna in the desert (v. 28-31.) From the type our Lord proceeded to the antitype and further revealed Himself, as 'the true bread from heaven' which 'giveth life unto the world.' (v. 32, 33.) They, regarding the manna in its physical substance as food for the body rather than in its spiritual signification as food for the soul, prayed Christ evermore to give them that bread. (v. 34.) Christ then showed more plainly that He spoke of Himself; and, 'The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven.' (v. 41.) Our Lord now advances a step further; He had before spoken of Himself as 'the bread which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world.' (v. 33.) He now says, 'The bread that I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world.' (v. 51.) By flesh, according to the Scripture use of the term in this connection, is meant His living body. As in the former instances we have noticed in this gospel, Christ took occasion from real water to represent Himself and His blessings metaphorically or spiritually as water, and as participated of by drinking; so here from real bread with which He had fed about 5000 persons, He calls attention to Himself and His blessings under the metaphor of food and as participated of by eating. But as we have noticed in the other cases, so here, this spiritual participation is as real to the soul as the participation of literal bread is to the body.

8. Chrysostom considered our Lord to use stronger language to the woman of Samaria than He did to the Jews in the sixth of St John. He remarks, 'Yet to the Jews once He said, "Whosoever shall eat of my flesh shall never hunger, "and he that believeth on me shall never thirst;" (John vi. 35.) but they not only did not believe, but were offended at Him. The woman had no such feeling; she remains and petitions. To the Jews He said, "He that believeth on me shall never thirst;" not so to the woman, but more grossly,

‘“He that drinketh of this water shall never thirst.” For the ‘promise related to spiritual and unseen things.’ (Hom. xxxii.) The slip of memory made by Chrysostom in quoting the 35th verse shows that in his mind coming to Christ and eating, meant one and the same thing.

9. Augustine considered the living water spoken of to the woman of Samaria and the living bread spoken of to the people of Capernaum as being parallel cases, referring to one and the same thing, only under different aspects, as the circumstances of the cases required, but that in each case what was intended as figurative, and relating to the mind, was misunderstood as literal and relating to the body. (21 70.)

10. To understand our Lord's words in this chapter literally, would be contrary to analogy, and an outrage on common sense. To eat raw flesh, whether of a living or dead human body, and to drink human blood, whether warm from the body or cold and clotted, is horrible to contemplate. This is literal, only literal, and anything less than this is not literal. Dr Wiseman contends that the Jews understood our Lord to teach this doctrine, and what is more monstrous, he strenuously maintains that they were right in so understanding Him. (34 6.)

11. Before proceeding further, we shall now consider Dr Wiseman's leading objections to a figurative interpretation of this interesting portion of Scripture, and his arguments in favour of a literal one. He assumes that, in the Lord's Supper, the body, soul, and divinity of Christ are present in the consecrated elements of bread and wine, or rather, ‘that ‘which was originally bread and wine is by the consecration ‘changed into the substance of the body and blood of our ‘Lord, together with His soul and divinity.’ This assuming doctor builds another assumption on this, viz., that in this sixth of St. John, our Lord refers ‘to a real eating of His ‘body and drinking of His blood in the sacrament of the ‘Eucharist.’ (34 1.) What is there that is sacramental in this chapter? Romanists and Romanizers do not condescend to inform us. So we must answer our own question. There are the things signified in the Lord's Supper, viz., the flesh or body and the blood of Christ. Of this there can be no

mistake. But what have we corresponding to the literal bread and wine of the Lord's Supper? In the commencement of the chapter we have the literal bread with which Christ fed the multitude, and we have Christ the bread of life. But it is not pretended that either of these is meant for the sacramental sign in the Eucharist. There is nothing in the whole chapter corresponding to wine, nor do our opponents even pretend that there is. Yet it must be confessed that in this chapter there are signs and things signified, figures and realities analogous to those in the Lord's Supper.

12. In the Eucharist we have 'This (bread) is my body.'

In this chapter we have 'My flesh is food indeed.' (v. 55.)

'I am the bread of life.' (v. 48.)

'I am the living bread.' (v. 51.)

In the Eucharist we have 'This (wine) is my blood.'

In this chapter we have 'My blood is drink indeed.' (v. 55.)

13. It should be especially noted that the order in which the signs and things signified, or the figures and realities in this chapter are placed, is fatal to the Roman doctrine of the Real Presence. Both Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey assume that in the Lord's Supper the literal bread and wine are made or become the body and blood of Christ. But in this chapter the real flesh or body of Christ and His real blood (on their theory) would seem to be made or become real food and drink,—that is, if we are to understand these phrases sacramentally, and apply as we ought one system of interpretation to both.

14. We come now to one of those instances in which Dr Wiseman, contrary to his own rule, sets aside the Catholic interpretations of ancient and comparatively modern times, and treats us to one of his own, which he nevertheless calls Catholic. (34 1.) This is unsupported by all antiquity, as well as by more modern Roman Catholic authors. The evidence of early antiquity against the teaching of Dr Wiseman, as recorded in 34 1-7, will be found at the close of this chapter. (secs. 52-74.)

15. Nicolas de Lyra, a household commentator with Roman Catholics before the Reformation, on the words, 'And the

'bread that I will give,' &c. (v. 51), says, 'After He treated 'on the spiritual bread, which is the word, here in a suitable 'manner, He treats on the spiritual bread, which is the sacrament.' According to this phraseology the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper are no more literally food than the word of God is.

16. Cornelius à Lapide, a zealous Roman Catholic commentator who wrote under the influence of the anathema of the Council of Trent, knew nothing of Dr Wiseman's theory of regarding one part of the sixth of St John as figurative, and not literal, and the other part as literal, and not figurative; one part as not referring at all to the Lord's Supper, and the other as referring to nothing else. Thus, on the 32d verse he says, 'Christ appointed His own bread, that is 'Himself, or His body in the Eucharist, as He Himself 'explains, vv. 35, 51, 54, and following.' Here this most learned Roman Catholic commentator refutes by anticipation Dr Wiseman's novel theory, and what the latter considers as not referring at all to the Eucharist, the former applies to it; that is, from the 32d verse to the 48th. Dr Wiseman must have presumed very largely upon the general unacquaintance of Protestants with the patristic testimony, or he never could have given currency to so outrageous an assumption. The question naturally arises, How would such novelties be received by his fellow priests? or how could he justify himself before them? Even supposing they knew no more of the real teaching of the Fathers than many Protestant ministers, they could not be ignorant of the teaching of their authorised and household commentators upon the main points relating to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

17. Perhaps, it may be asked, what had Dr Wiseman particularly to gain by his outrageous but plausible assumption? If in ignorance of the real facts of the case his statement could have been believed, the advantage on his side of the controversy would have been enormous. Beyond all question, Holy Scripture shows, as Dr Wiseman teaches, that 'the figurative application of bread or food to wisdom or 'doctrines, by which the mind is nourished, was one in ordinary use among the Jews.' (34 2.) He, as may there be

seen, illustrates this by many texts of Scripture, texts commonly used by eminent Protestants for the like purpose. Now, by not only admitting but maintaining that from the 32d verse to the 35th verse Christ ‘identifies Himself ‘with His doctrines, and calls Himself the *bread of life*,’ he is so far one with the Protestant. Does the Protestant hold that in Holy Scripture knowledge and religious instruction are frequently represented under the metaphor of food and bread, and that in this sixth chapter of St John, Christ in this aspect is represented as bread for the soul, food for the devout mind? To all this Dr Wiseman says, ‘Yes ; very good.’ He admits all that is contended for by the Protestant in regard to one part of the chapter, by which means he exhausts the Protestant argument by in fact admitting it. But then he admits this only in relation to that part of the chapter in which he holds in common with Protestants, that Christ represents Himself under the metaphor of bread, and is participated of only by faith. But, in the latter part, he maintains that Christ drops the metaphor and speaks of Himself, not as participated of by faith, but as literally eaten by the mouth. But the question is, if the term bread, up to the 48th verse, in relation to Christ, is to be understood metaphorically, and from the 48th verse literally, on what authority does this distinction rest? Dr Wiseman says, it is so, and probably he is the first that ever said so. But in so saying, he falsifies the entire testimony of the Catholic Church, and although that is of no particular consequence to us, if he speaks the truth, it should be a quietus to all real Romanists and Romanizers, and they ought, on their own confessed principles, to repudiate such novelties. But, as Dr Wiseman chose, for reasons that were best known to himself, to cast aside his own authorised authorities, and appeal to the letter of Holy Scripture, we must follow him here also. He says, ‘The signification of Christ’s discourse, as far as the 48th ‘verse, *or* 51st verse.’ Why this *or*? He makes the distinction commence at the 48th verse, and rigidly adheres to it, and, in fact, makes his main argument depend upon it. He says, ‘It is very remarkable, that never once, through this part ‘of the discourse does He suffer the idea of *eating Him* to ‘escape His lips.’ (34 3.)

18. Most modern Romanists consider, that from the 33d to the 58th verse of the sixth of St John, their doctrine of the real presence is taught. Archdeacon Denison entertains an opinion of this kind ; (36 2) and probably it has the sanction of his teacher and defender, Dr Pusey. But Bellarmine, the Corypheus of Roman controversy, says, ' it is known that ' the Eucharist is not handled in the whole chapter : for Christ ' there discourses of natural bread, the miracles of the loaves, ' of faith, and of the incarnation, in a great part of the chapter. ' The question is only concerning those words, verse 51.' (Lib. i. *de Euch.* cap. 3.) Bishop Taylor tells us, ' The secret of the ' thing was this : the arguments against the sacramental sense ' of these words drawn from the following verses between these ' and the fifty-first, could not so well be answered, and there- ' fore Bellarmine found out the trick of confessing all till you ' come thither, as appears in his answer to the ninth argument.' (*The Real Presence*, sec. iii. 1.) Dr Wiseman, as we have seen, improves upon this trick of confessing all till you come to the 48th verse. The same learned author states, ' Very ' many of the most learned Romanists affirm, that in this ' chapter, Christ does not speak of sacramental or oral mandu- ' cation, or of the sacrament at all. Johannes de Ragusio, ' Biel, Cusanus, Ruard, Tapper, Cajetan, Hessels, Jansenius, ' Waldensis, and Armachanus.' (*Ibid.*, sec. iii. 2.)

19. Roman Catholic expositors of this chapter, since the Council of Trent, may be divided into three antagonistic classes. The most numerous class regard the sacrament of the Eucharist as being taught from the 32d verse to the 59th. A less numerous class consider, that there is no direct reference to the Eucharist at all ; the least numerous class, such as Bellarmine and Dr Wiseman, believe this part of the chapter relates to a participation of Christ the Bread of Life by faith only, and the other part to a real eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament. Such a divided testimony is of little worth, excepting as it shows the inherent weakness of the Roman doctrine of the Real Presence as far as this chapter is concerned.

20. Several modern Fathers consider that there is a transition in our Lord's discourse, not at the 48th verse, but in the

51st verse, but not such a one as that maintained by Dr Wiseman. Theophylact and De Lyra think our Lord there begins to discourse on the Eucharist, and both were believers in the doctrine of the Real Presence. Our Lord in the 51st verse evidently alludes to the sacrifice of His body on the cross, and the shedding of His blood. Dean Alford on this verse says, 'From this time we hear no more of *bread*; this figure is 'dropped, and the reality takes its place.' This is rather a loose statement, and as we shall see, requires revision; any how, it gives no real help to Dr Wiseman. Our Lord says, 'and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will 'give for the life of the world.' (v. 51.) The word bread applied to Christ here and everywhere else in this chapter is a metaphor, but the word flesh is a proper word, and Christ teaches beyond all doubt that in order to having life in Him there must be real though spiritual participation of it and of His blood. But Dean Alford is surely wrong when he says, 'From this time we hear no more of bread;' for we hear of it at the close of the discourse, 'This is that bread which came 'down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are 'dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever,' (v. 58.) and respecting this verse he very properly says, 'it forms the 'solemn conclusion of the discourse, referring back to the Bread 'with which it began and to its difference from the perishable 'food which they had extolled.'

21. In the 33d verse Christ said, 'For the bread of God is 'he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the 'world.' In the 47th verse He declares, 'Verily, verily, I 'say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.' At the summing up of the discourse after He had spoken of His real flesh and blood He did as we have just seen come back to the original metaphor. (v. 58.) There can be no reasonable question but that the term bread in relation to Christ in this verse and throughout this chapter has one and the same meaning. Eating the Bread which came down from heaven and believing in Him who is metaphorically called Bread, are equivalent phrases, and are generally so understood by the Fathers. Thus Augustine on John vi. 29, says, 'Why make ready the teeth and belly? Believe and

'thou hast eaten.' (21 69.) Again, on the 42d verse, 'These men were far from the bread of heaven, and knew not how to hunger after it. Having jaws to eat with, they list not to stir them,' &c. . . . Our Lord 'said that He was the bread which came down from heaven, exhorting us to believe on Him. For to believe on Him this is to eat the living bread. He that believeth eateth.' (21 71, 72.)

22. Dean Alford takes exception to Augustine's interpretation, and asks, 'What is this eating and drinking? Clearly not merely faith: for faith answers to the hand reaching forth for the food,—but is not the act of eating. Faith is a necessary condition of the act; so that we can hardly say with Augustine, "Believe, and thou hast eaten;" but, "Believe "and thou wilt eat." Inasmuch as faith will necessarily, in its energizing lead to this partaking, we sometimes incorrectly say that it *is* faith:—but for strict accuracy this is not enough.' (*On John* vi. 53.) There can be no objection to this interpretation. How Zwingle and Calvin expressed themselves on this point may be seen 29 31-35, and 30 8-11. The difference between Augustine and Zwingle on the one hand and Calvin on the other, is only verbal and not real. It should be borne in mind that this difference, as to the mode of receiving Christ rather relates to receiving Him out of the sacrament or unsacramentally, than in the sacrament or sacramentally. (29 35; 30 3, 8.)

23. Dr Wiseman invents a capricious division of the chapter at the close of the 47th verse, and says, 'It is very remarkable that never once, through this part of the discourse, does He suffer the idea of *eating Him* to escape His lips.' (34 3.) To this it is answered, Christ at the beginning of His discourse (v. 27.) and at its close (v. 58.) speaks of Himself as bread. Surely He does not represent Himself under the aspect of two different kinds of bread, one kind as far as the close of the 47th verse, and another kind from the 48th verse? Yet so Dr Wiseman teaches. In the former part he considers that Christ figuratively represents His doctrines under the aspect of bread or food (34 2.) But strictly speaking it was rather what His doctrines taught that was food or bread, and not the doctrines themselves. In this chapter He plainly taught that He

would sacrifice Himself for the life of the world. This was the great doctrine of Christ and of His holy apostles. But when He then spoke it was a matter of the future. 'The bread 'that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of 'the world.' (v. 51.) But this bread or food could not be eaten until it was given, and Christ speaks of eating it when given and not before. He could not therefore well speak of eating this food before He had described what it would be, and having done so, He speaks of eating it. This was the food for which they were to labour (v. 27.) and as soon as He had described what it would be, and not before, He speaks of eating it, and the happy consequences which would follow.

24. Dr Wiseman states, 'Our opponents suppose the phrases 'in the two portions of the discourse to be parallel, and to 'refer equally to faith. By this reasoning it follows, that to 'eat His flesh (v. 54, 55, 56, 57.) means the same as to possess the bread of life mentioned in the former section (v. 32, '33, 35. . . . But if to feed on Christ means to believe in Christ, then, to eat the flesh of Christ (if the phrase has 'to be considered parallel), must signify to believe *in the flesh* 'of Christ.' (34 5.) To this curious piece of argumentation, it is answered, 'To feed on Christ means to participate of 'Christ by faith, and to eat the flesh of Christ whether in or 'out of the sacrament, is to do exactly the same thing.'

25. Dr Wiseman lays it down as a rule, 'That whenever 'our Lord's hearers found difficulties, or raised objections to 'His words, from taking them in their literal sense, while He 'intended them to be taken figuratively, His constant practice 'was to explain them.' (34 7.) To confirm this supposed rule, he refers to several passages in the gospels, some of which are not exactly cases in point. Three, which are cases for illustration, and which are taken from this gospel of St John, we shall consider, and shall add to them two more from the same source. The texts are, John ii. 18-22; iii. 1-21; iv. 10-15; v. 24-29; vii, 33-39. In all these passages, our Lord is not speaking plainly so as to be understood, but in such a way as to raise the expectation of his hearers respecting matters of infinite moment, and which were soon to come to pass, but could not be understood until they were fulfilled

26. We shall take these passages in the order in which they stand, beginning with John ii. 18-22, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. . . . When, therefore, he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them.' Dr Wiseman admits that this is at variance with the rule which he has laid down; (34 8.) but says, 'in John vi. our Saviour is delivering a doctrine; in the second chapter, He is uttering a prophecy,' &c. (34 9.) Dr Wiseman may call one a prophecy, and the other a doctrine, and assume that one is 'all plain and intelligible,' and the other 'obscure and involved.' But, in truth, what he calls a doctrine, was more obscure and involved than that which he calls a prophecy, and so taught Chrysostom, who says, 'For if as yet they had no clear knowledge of the resurrection, and so knew not what, "Destroy this Temple, and in "three days I will raise it up," might mean, much more would they be ignorant of what is said here. For these words were less clear than those.' (*In Joannem Hom.* xlv. tom. viii. p. 236.)

27. John iii. 1-21. According to Dr Wiseman's own showing, Nicodemus would be familiar with our Lord's language respecting the new birth, it being expressive of Jewish proselytism. (34 7.) But why did our Lord re-assert the same sentiment? Not so much to explain what He said, as to fix in the mind of the Jewish Rabbi the spiritual nature of the kingdom. It was the character of this kingdom that was so perplexing to Nicodemus (see sec. 3.), and our Lord, instead of speaking plainly to him respecting it, so spoke as to excite his attention, and raise his expectations concerning it. In fact, our Lord delivered a prophetic discourse in which, as in the sixth of St. John, He spoke of Himself as from heaven, and as having to suffer and die. Our Lord impressed upon the mind of Nicodemus the spiritual nature of His kingdom, as He did on His disciples in the sixth of St. John. (v. 63.) The two cases are exactly parallel. Nicodemus, like the faithful disciples believingly waited the accomplishment of the events, and in due time entered the kingdom.

28. John iv. 10-15. Dr Wiseman admits this is not for, but against, his rule. He says, 'Our Saviour there speaks of

‘giving living waters in a figurative sense, and the Samaritan woman manifestly understood Him literally; yet He gives no ‘explanation.’ (34 10.) Chrysostom, as we have seen (sec. 8 above), understood our Lord to speak in the same style to this woman as He did to the Jews in the sixth of St. John. This is one of the many instances, in which we shall find Dr Wiseman and his school differ from these ancient Fathers.

29. John v. 24-29. Our Lord emphatically declared a spiritual resurrection to His hearers, at which they marvelled; but He offered no explanation of that at which they did marvel, but as in the other cases, so in this, they must await the fulfilment of what He said.

30. John vii. 33-39. Here again our Lord spoke figuratively, but the Jews understood Him literally, yet He gave no explanation to them. And although it is not said how the Jews received Christ’s invitation to drink of Himself as from a fountain, we are certain He was not understood in the sense He meant, and hence St. John, years after the words were uttered, yea, after they were fulfilled, showed that they were prophetic, and related to the commencement of the kingdom of God, as we have already shown.

31. John vi. 52-58. We come now to the particular part of the sixth of St. John, for the illustration of which these others have been adduced from the same gospel. Dr Wiseman maintains, ‘That whenever our Lord’s hearers raised ‘objections to His words, from taking them in their literal ‘sense, while He intended them to be taken figuratively, His ‘constant practice was to explain them instantly.” (34 7.) It is certain, as we have seen, that it was not His constant practice. Again he says, ‘That when the words of Christ were ‘*rightly* understood in their literal sense, and by that correct ‘interpretation gave rise to murmurs or objections, it was His ‘custom to stand to His words, and repeat again the very ‘sentiment which had given the offence.’ (34 7.) Thus our Lord said, ‘I am the living bread which came down from ‘heaven: if any man shall eat of this bread, he shall live ‘for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which ‘I will give for the life of the world.’ (v. 51). At this the Jews took offence, and ‘strove among themselves, saying, How

‘can this man give us his flesh to eat.’ (v. 52). Our Lord then, instead of explaining His words, proceeds to re-assert them more strongly, ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye ‘eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.’ (v. 53). The argument of Dr Wiseman is, that if these Jews had misunderstood our blessed Lord’s words, He would have explained them, but as He did not explain, but re-assert them, He really meant them to be understood exactly in the manner in which Dr Wiseman conceives that the Jews did understand them. On the contrary, we maintain that in whatever different senses the Jews did understand them, our Lord explained to them that His words were figurative, and not literal; spiritual, relating to the soul, and not to the body. Our Lord said to them, ‘The words ‘that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.’ (ver. 63). It was after our Lord thus addressed the disciples generally, and not before, that ‘many of his disciples went ‘back, and walked no more with Him.’ (v. 66). If there is any force in Dr Wiseman’s rule, viz., ‘That whenever our ‘Lord’s hearers found difficulties, or raised objections to His ‘words, from taking them in their literal sense, while He ‘intended them to be taken figuratively, His constant practice ‘was to explain them instantly, in a figurative manner,’ (33 7,) it is most forcible against himself, for our Lord did explain His words in a figurative and spiritual manner. But we also charge Dr Wiseman with assuming without proof that any of the Jews who heard our Lord understood His words literally, that is, really to eat His flesh and drink His blood with the natural mouth, as Dr Wiseman contends. (34 6.) After the Jews had heard our Lord’s words, they ‘strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us His flesh to eat?’ They certainly were not all of one mind as to *how* Christ would give His flesh to be eaten. Those men whom Christ had fed as to their bodies were in number about 5000, (John vi. 10), ‘beside women and children.’ (Matt. xiv. 21.) Many of these had followed Christ to Capernaum, and there in the synagogue He administered food to their souls, by way of preparing their minds for that great event when, by His own death, He would bear the punishment of the sin of the world.

The audience doubtless was large, and took a profound interest in His teaching, regarding Him as one who could easily supply their necessities, and as a most likely person to make them a good king. It seems their intention had been to take Him by force, and make Him their king (John vi. 15.) Every word coming from such a Teacher, under such circumstances, would be well weighed by so interested an auditory, and they strove among themselves, that is, they fought with one another, not with swords, but with words, not in bodily, but in mental conflict, as to how Christ would give His flesh to be eaten. They were not all of Dr Wiseman's opinion respecting the mode of eating Christ's flesh, if they were, there would have been no contention respecting it. Doubtless there would be many different opinions as to how Christ would give His flesh to be eaten, hence some strove or fought for one opinion, and some for another. Their earnestness in maintaining their respective opinions is manifest from the word employed to denote it, which only occurs in three other instances (Acts vii. 26; 2 Timothy ii. 24; and James iv. 2), and from which its force may be seen. It is certain many of these discontented and disappointed disciples were not of Dr. Wiseman's opinion. But the question is, were any of them of that opinion? We have no proof of it, and it seems to rest on a groundless assumption. Dr Wiseman, making a virtue of necessity, says, 'in fact this requires no proof,' (34 6,) and yet he ventures to give a very slender and doubtful one, namely, that 'Most commentators agree that the Capharnaïtes took 'our Saviour's words in their literal sense.' (34 6.) Here proof is made to depend upon a majority of commentators. It is more than probable that many of that number never took the trouble really to examine the matter, but contented themselves with a mere superficial view of it, and took for granted what they ought to have proved. Now had they put themselves into the position of those to whom our Lord spoke, by having their minds well informed of the fact that it is common in the Hebrew Scripture to represent abstract and mental operations in a concrete manner, and that nothing was more common than to represent the communication of religious and mental instruction to the soul after the manner of feeding the

body, they would have come to a very different conclusion. Dr. Wiseman found it convenient to admit this in regard to a part of our Lord's teaching on this very occasion, and was shrewd enough to record it with a view to disarm his more intelligent opponents. (34 2.) Most of the Fathers, however, consider that the Jews understood our Lord to teach that they were literally to eat His flesh and to drink his blood. We maintain that the sacred narrative itself gives no proof of it. Origen, one of the most able and learned of all the Fathers, distinctly states, 'They were not so foolish as to suppose when 'saying these things Christ invites the hearers to come and 'eat His flesh.' (11 3). Many of the disciples who followed Christ, looking upon Him rather as a temporal than as a spiritual deliverer, when they became convinced from His own teaching that His mission was purely spiritual, took offence, as on this occasion, and left Him. The circumstances of the case do not require that we should believe that our blessed Lord allowed a number of His followers to forsake Him in the full persuasion that He had been teaching them that they were actually and really with their mouths to eat His flesh and drink His blood. It is quite sufficient for us to know that the disciples who were discontented did not understand our Lord's words spiritually as they ought to have done, but in some other sense not spiritual, and at which they were offended, and walked no more with Him. But before they departed our Lord plainly told them that His words were spiritual, which we shall do well now to consider.

32. 'What, and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up 'where He was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the 'flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, 'they are spirit and they are life' (v. 62, 63). Feeding the outer man with food profited nothing in a spiritual point of view. The soul—the spirit of man—did not receive life by such means, for it is the office of the Spirit to give life, and the flesh profiteth nothing thereto. 'What and if ye shall see 'the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?' It should be especially noted that the participation of Christ, whether under the metaphor of living water or living bread, was subsequent to His resurrection and ascension. In this gospel we

have frequent reference to both. The resurrection, of course, included His ascension (Acts ii. 29-36). This was to be the crowning proof to His disciples of His Messiahship, and of the truth of all He had taught them, and to this He frequently referred. Nicodemus and His other believing disciples waited patiently until that interesting event occurred, when that which to them had been previously dark and obscure was made plain and obvious. But then why did Christ represent such an event as hypothetical—‘*If* ye shall see the Son of Man ascend, &c.?’ There was, there could be, no doubt about the event, it was as certain as the Son of Man, who was also Jehovah, could make it. Elsewhere we read in our version—‘And I, *if* I be lifted up’ (John xii. 32); ‘and *if* I go’ (xiv. 3), His being lifted up and His going were unconditional and matters of absolute certainty. He had said to Nicodemus—‘The Son of Man must be lifted up’ (John iii. 14). Those, too, to whom Christ said, ‘*If* I be lifted up, understood Him to make an unconditional and absolute statement, for they said, ‘How sayest thou, the Son of Man must be lifted up’ (com. v. 32 with v. 34. The ordinary reader would have better understood our Lord’s words if, as in some modern versions, the word *when* had been employed instead of the word *if*. In 1 John iii. 2, our version has given that rendering, ‘But we know ‘that *when* [not if *ἐάν*] he shall appear.’ In these cases the Syriac version gives, as the sense of the Greek, the word *when*. But if that had been our Lord’s real meaning, no doubt His apostle would have expressed it in Greek. We should expect that as our Lord addressed His teaching to Jews, His language would be Hebraistic. In the Hebrew Bible, the word **כִּי** generally rendered in our version by the word *if*, but sometimes by the words *when* and *surely*, is by the LXX. promiscuously rendered by the Greek conjunctions *εἰ* and *ἐάν* (*if*), and in some cases these renderings are given in connection with phrases where neither doubt nor contingency is implied, but the very opposite. A few of these cases will serve to illustrate the point in hand. ‘*If* I shall leave thee’ (2 Kings ii. 2, 4, 6, and iv. 30); ‘*if* they shall enter into ‘my rest’ (Psalm xcv. 11; Hebrews iii. 11, and iv. 3); ‘*if* ye ‘shall give your daughters to their sons, and *if* ye take their

'daughters to your sons.' (Nehe. xiii. 25.) '*If* ye shall arouse, and *if* ye shall wake my love.' (Song of Sol. ii. 7, and iii. 5.) These are the literal renderings of both the Hebrew and the LXX. The same style of speech occurs in Mark viii. 12, which, literally rendered, is, '*If* a sign shall be given to this generation,' but in Matt. xvi. 4, we have, 'There shall no sign be given it,' which is the literal translation. In these cases the reader cannot fail to see the importance and force of the word *if*. But in these instances the word denotes *certainly not*. We require some cases where it denotes *certainty* without the negative, as we believe it does in the phrases which we desire to illustrate and confirm. '*If* (when) thou liest down, thou shalt not be afraid, (Prov. iii. 24), 'and *if* (when) the vintage shall be done.' (Isa. xxiv. 13). '*If* (when) they had made an end of eating the grass.' (Amos vii. 2.) '*If* (when) the Lord shall have washed away the filth 'of the daughter of Zion.' Literally, '*If* the Lord hath washed away,' Meaning, 'the Lord surely will wash away,' &c. (Isa. iv. 4.)

33. We have adduced sufficient evidence to show that when our Lord said, "*If* ye shall see the Son of man ascend," "*If* I be lifted up," "*If* I go," He did not use necessarily the language of contingency and doubt, but most probably, as understood by those who heard Him, the language of confidence and certainty. The assurance our Lord gave His disciples of seeing Him ascend into heaven, or their having that information on the certain testimony of others (John ii. 19 ; vi. 62 ; xvi. 28), and the things consequent upon that event, would make all things plain to them. We have seen that our Lord's invitation to the thirsty to come to Him and drink had reference to what could only transpire after He had ascended into heaven. 'This spake He of the spirit which 'they that believe on Him should receive, for the Holy Ghost 'was not yet given ; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.' (John vii. 39). Respecting our Lord's words now under consideration, interpreted in the light of their fulfilment, we might in like manner remark : 'This spake He of the operation of the Holy Ghost which they who believe on Him 'should experience ; which could not be as yet, because that

‘Jesus was not yet ascended.’ Our Lord referring to this happy time had taught the woman of Samaria that God must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. He had also, in reference to the same event, impressed on the mind of Nicodemus what was spiritual and what was not so, and between which there could be no combination. ‘That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit.’ With the same object, and to the same purpose, our Lord uttered these words now under consideration: ‘It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life.’ If we go to St. Peter’s sermon on the day of Pentecost, all is made plain.

34. Dr Pusey would fain persuade us to be content with the imperfect knowledge which Nicodemus and some other disciples possessed respecting the true teaching of Christ in regard to His kingdom. He thinks that they ought to have been content with their antepentecostal knowledge, and by implication teaches that we ought to be content with the same knowledge, for he says, ‘Christ answers not the striving of the Jews, “How can this man give us His flesh to eat?” He never answereth; and we if we are wise, shall never ask how they can be elements of this world, and yet His very Body and Blood.’ (35 2). We need not now turn aside to consider Dr Pusey’s assumption without any attempt at proof that our Lord referred directly to His Holy Supper. It is more important to notice that our Lord did answer these inquiries, and that those who made them are to be commended, and not condemned; and that we shall be wise, and not foolish, if we follow their examples. It is true our Lord’s answers were not understood until they were interpreted by the events to which they referred; and as these included the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, which were in fact soon to take place, Nicodemus waited patiently like the other disciples, on whom the Lord had enjoined a participation of His flesh and blood, until the fulfilment of these events. St. Peter’s sermon on the day of Pentecost, relating as it did to the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, with their immediate consequences, would

make all plain both to Nicodemus and Christ's other disciples, especially after they had believingly received the words, 'Jesus of Nazareth being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain, whom God hath raised up . . . God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ.' We are told that 'When they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest, Brother men, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent for the remission of sins, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ.' (Acts ii. 23, 24, 36-38). The doctrine of Christ in relation to the kingdom of God, only imperfectly understood by Nicodemus, was now simple and plain, and was exemplified in the experience of thousands, who were now born of the Spirit and of water. Yea, those who said, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' would have a plain answer to their inquiry; and even those who shed the blood of Christ would now know what it was shed for, and its saving effects. To use the language and sentiment of Augustine: 'Many of them believed, and the shedding of the blood of Christ was forgiven them. At first they shed it while they raged; now, *they drink it while they believed.*' (21 103.) All would now have the opportunity of knowing that the words of Christ, whether as spoken by Himself or His apostles, accompanied as they were by the Holy Ghost, now given in consequence of Christ's ascension and intercession, 'were indeed spirit and life,' and that ^{it is} _{it} the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth 'nothing.'

35. Had there been any truth in Dr Wiseman's and Dr Pusey's interpretation of this sixth chapter of St. John, viz., that the flesh of Christ is to be literally and really eaten by the mouth, and His blood literally and really swallowed by the throat, in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, one would have supposed that St. Peter's sermon would have been on the subject. Such, however, was not the case; and it should be observed, that after the kingdom of God or Church of Christ was planted, the Lord's Supper is only incidentally and indirectly referred to by the Apostle Paul.

36. We must leave Dr Wiseman for the present, and hold a little intercourse with Archdeacon Denison and his defender, Dr Pusey. The Archdeacon assumes that there is a sacramental eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of His blood directly taught in the sixth of St. John, and that the statements respecting the body and blood must be taken literally. (36 1, 2.) But whilst he maintains that the words are to be taken literally, he also contends 'that the body and blood 'of Christ are really present after a manner spiritually,' and that this 'is proved by the words of our blessed Lord (John 'vi. 61-63), and also by the consideration that St. Paul (1 'Cor. x. 3, 4), where he is speaking of types of the Holy 'Eucharist, the manna and the rock, applies to both the word 'spiritual.' (36 4.) But in neither of these instances is there any allusion to a presence. The words spirit and spiritual are not intended here to be the converse of what is material, or to describe a presence after the manner of a spirit. The word spiritual, as applied to the word rock, does not mean the spiritual presence of a rock, but the word rock used in a metaphorical or allegorical sense,—not a literal rock of any kind. In this sense, 'the great city [Rome] is spiritually called Sodom,' (Rev. xi. 8). That is, it is metaphorically or allegorically so called. Dr Pusey himself says, 'St Paul does 'not say, "that rock was Christ," until he had before said, "'that spiritual rock," showing that he spake in a figure' (35 15); that is, figuratively or allegorically. The phrase, 'The words which I speak unto you they are spirit' (John vi. 63), whether as interpreted from itself, or in the light of this passage respecting the spiritual Rock, does not teach a presence after the manner of a spirit; but that what Christ had said was to be understood spiritually.

37. It would seem that Archdeacon Denison's assumption that our Lord's discourse in the sixth of St. John directly referred to a real participation of His body and blood in the Eucharist, both by worthy and unworthy communicants, was only a ruse; for he quotes with approval the following: 'All 'those considerations which are adduced from the sixth of 'St. John, to prove that the wicked neither eat the flesh of Christ nor drink His blood, are foreign to the purpose; be-

'cause the Lord in that place is not speaking about sacramental eating, but about spiritual eating.' (36 6.) On his principle of argumentation, or rather in the absence of any principle, he could prove anything which the emergency of of the case might require.

38. Dr Pusey remarks on the words, 'Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood (He Himself says the amazing words) eateth me, and so receiveth into himself, in an ineffable manner, his Lord Himself, "dwelleth" (our Lord says) "in me, and I in him;" and having Christ within him, not only *shall* he *have*, but he "*hath*" already "eternal life;" because he hath Him who is "the only true God and eternal life.' (35 2.) This is an imposition upon the unlearned reader. Even if we admit that the words of our Lord here exclusively refer to sacramental eating, and not to eating by faith only, without the sacrament; yet no more is here affirmed or promised to a sacramental participation of Christ's body and blood than is affirmed or promised to faith in Christ without a sacramental participation. Thus St. John writes: 'He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life' (iii. 36). Again, 'He that believeth on me *hath* everlasting life' (vi. 47). The words referred to by Dr Pusey are 'Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath* eternal life' (v. 54). Assuredly, if these simple and plain words mean anything, as much is affirmed or promised to a belief in Christ as to eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Christ.

39. It is unpardonable in Dr Pusey as a Regius professor of Hebrew to lay such stress on the word '*hath* eternal life,' when he knows, or ought to know, that the present tense in holy Scripture is often used for the future (see ch. ii. 10-13), and is so in this case; for we are not to understand that the believer in Christ, or he that rightly participates of the body and blood of Christ '*hath* already eternal life, but that such a person assuredly shall have it when the time of its bestowal comes, which in the New Testament is always represented as being future, viz. at the resurrection of the just, as is plain from the following passages: Matt. xxv. 46; Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30; Rom. vi. 22; 1 Tim. i. 16; vi. 12, 19;

Titus i. 2 ; iii. 7. Nor is the case of St John an exception, for he speaks of eternal life as *promised* to the believer (1 John ii. 25). In his Gospel we read, 'He that heareth my word, 'and believeth on Him that sent me, *hath* everlasting life, 'and shall not come into condemnation,' or rather, more literally translated, 'cometh not into judgment' (v. 24). It is plain from this verse that having eternal life and coming not into judgment refer to one and the same moment of time. When then, does this take place? When a man either believes in Christ, or rightly participates of His holy body and blood in the Lord's Supper? or at the resurrection of the just? The answer is given for us a few verses further on in the same chapter, 'They that have done good, unto the resurrection of '[eternal] life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation, or judgment' (v. 29). It is not to be disputed that the believer in Christ already possesses life, and by virtue of Christ's living, he will live for ever, but that which the holy Scriptures designate by the name of eternal, or everlasting life, is absolutely future.

40. In another place Dr Pusey again represents the indwelling of Christ and the impartation of life as exclusively confined to the Lord's Supper, he says, 'By making us, 'through the sacrament of baptism, members of His Son, by 'giving us, through the holy eucharist, not in any carnal way, 'but really and spiritually, the flesh and blood of the incarnate 'Son, whereby He dwelleth in us, and we in Him. Through 'these, He imparteth to us the life which He Himself is' (356). He again assumes without proof that the text which he quotes, exclusively relates to eating the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, Granting this assumption we maintain, according to the express teaching of holy Scripture, and as interpreted by the early church, that, in order to participate rightly of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, we must really and savingly partake of them before coming to that holy rite. Dr Pusey admits that we must be made members of Christ before coming. And by members of course he must mean *living* members. But whence can life be derived, except by a participation of the body and blood of Christ? For the Lord Himself has solemnly declared, 'except

'ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye 'have no life in you.' (John vi. 53).

41. The union between Christ and those who are His, and the means by which it is effected, are variously described in the New Testament, but in no part of it is that union, and the mode of participating of it so touchingly described as by our Lord Himself as recorded in this sixth of St John. It has already been observed, that in this and other parts of this Gospel, our Lord spoke prophetically, the full meaning of which was not unveiled until the Christian Church was established. To understand, then, our Lord's teaching, we must sit at the feet of His holy apostles, and learn from them as qualified by Him, all things touching His kingdom, and especially His union with us, and the means of our participating of it.

42. One of the most important Scriptural phrases relating to the point we have to investigate, is, 'remission of sins,' as occurring in such passages as Matt. xxvi. 28 ; Luke xxiv. 47 ; Acts v. 31 ; xiii. 38; and Ephes. i. 7. Now what is remission of sins as explained by the apostles of Christ? Deliverance from its consequences. And what are these? Death and judgment. Hence, to be saved, and to be made alive, in relation to the soul, are in the New Testament occasionally used as equivalent terms. Thus in John iii. 17, we read, 'The world through 'Him might be saved.' St John in his epistles referring to the same thing, says, 'That God sent His only begotten Son 'into the world, that we might live through Him' (1 John iv. 9). In the ancient Syriac version, in both these passages we have the phrase 'might live through Him.' In this version the word to save or be saved (*σώζω*), except in one solitary instance, is translated by the word to live, or give life. Thus in the Acts of the Apostles we read, 'Sirs, what must I do, that I may have life?' And 'they said to him; believe in the name of our Lord Jesus Messiah, and thou wilt have life' (xvi. 30, 31). By what means, then, does a man dead in sin become alive therefrom? In no other way than by a real participation of the body and blood of Christ. Or in other words, men obtain life through the flesh of Christ which He gave for the life of the world, through His blood which He had shed for many for remission of sins. Why, then, do such

come to the Lord's Supper? Not simply to be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and certainly not to obtain life; with them these are matters of sweet experience and devout and grateful realization. Our Lord, when He instituted His holy supper, did not say, 'Do this and ye shall live, or obtain life,' but 'Do this in remembrance of me.' And His servant Paul did not say, 'As often as ye eat this bread and drink 'this cup ye partake of the Lord's body and blood, and receive "the life which He Himself is."' But, as often 'as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come.' According to Holy Scripture, it was one thing to be a *partaker* (μέτοχος) of the flesh and blood of Christ, and by that means have life, and another thing to come unto the fellowship (κοινωνία) of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The former was an individual participation, and the life received thereby was accepted more or less after the manner of a man receiving a reprieve from death; but in the latter, the reception was not simply individual, but in common, in company and fellowship with others in the same favoured position, and not as those who were being justified, emerging from the condemnation of death, but as those who have been justified, and to whom there is no condemnation. The first was a real and substantial participation which brought life with it; the second sacramental, but also real and substantial to those who received rightly, not now in imparting, but in strengthening and confirming the life which has been imparted, and as it were, making it more abundant.

43. This distinction is clearly laid down by St Paul in 1 Cor. x. 16-21, where, warning the Corinthians against certain idolatrous practices, he was led to speak especially of the action in the Lord's Supper. This is noticed by Chrysostom, who, on the words 'The bread which we break is it not 'the communion (κοινωνία a partaking in common) of the body 'of Christ?' especially remarks, 'Wherefore said he not the 'participation (μετοχή)? Because he intended to express something more, and to point out how close was the union, in 'that we communicate not only by participating and partaking, 'but also by being united.' (22 20).

44. Before coming to the Lord's Table, it was necessary

to be *partakers* of the Lord's body before there could be a right *participation in common* with others in that ordinance. Chrysostom, in reference to giving thanks over the cup, says : ' Since we too, recounting over the cup the unspeakable ' mercies of God and all that *we have been made partakers of*, ' so we offer it, and *we partake in common*.' (22 19.) The words ' We are all partakers of that one bread,' were commonly interpreted by the early church as referring to a participation antecedent to coming to the Lord's Table. In the beginning of the 6th century, when rites and ceremonies had increased and superstition abounded, the question was asked, Are men saved who die before they are permitted to eat the flesh of the Lord and drink His blood in the Eucharist, when the Saviour said, ' Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ' and drink His blood, ye have no life in you ? ' An answer was given to this question by Fulgentius, a leading bishop of his day, to the effect, that before coming to the Lord's Table those who came rightly should be already partakers of Christ's body and blood. He says : ' The blessed Paul, when in a certain place he had said, " The cup of blessing which we " bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ " ' (1 Cor. x. 16), in order that he might show that we are the ' real bread itself and the real body, immediately added, ' " For we being many are one bread and one body, all of us ' " who partake of that one bread." ' (21 132.) Again he says : ' Wherefore since " we being many are one bread and ' " one body," then does each one begin to be a partaker of ' that one bread when he begins to be a member of that one ' body, and is joined in baptism to the Head Christ.' (21 133.) ' This,' he says, ' we well know that the holy Fathers with- ' out hesitation believed and taught' (21 134); and he especially quotes Augustine to that effect, part of which quotation is : ' If then ye wish to understand the body of Christ, hear the ' apostle saying to the faithful, " Ye are the body of Christ ' " and His members." If, therefore, ye are the body of ' Christ and His members, the mystery (sacrament) of your- ' selves is placed upon the Lord's Table ; ye receive the ' mystery of yourselves.' (21 136.) Origen, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Bede, Theophylact, Aquinas, Bertram, Rabanus

Maurus, also teach that we must be made bread—that is, the Lord's body before coming to His table. Bede, as a specimen of the rest, quoting Augustine with approval on the text in question, says: 'Because Christ hath suffered for us 'He hath commended unto us, in this sacrament, His own 'body and blood, which also He hath even made us ourselves. 'For we also have been made His body; and through His 'mercy we are what we receive.' (24 28.) Again, as if quoting from Augustine, though probably from Fulgentius, he says: 'No one should doubt, then, that every one of the 'faithful is made a partaker of the Lord's body and blood 'when, in baptism, he is made a member of Christ; nor is 'alienated from the fellowship of that bread and cup, although, 'before he eats that bread and drinks that cup, being constituted in the unity of the body of Christ, he is cut off 'from this world. He surely is not deprived of the benefit and 'participation of that sacrament, since he himself has obtained this which that sacrament signifies.' (24 27.) Cyril very plainly teaches that believers, before coming to the Lord's Supper, may be made partakers, and partakers in common, or fellows of Christ (15 10); and also may be made, or become of the same body and the same blood with Him. (15 12.)

45. That the flesh of Christ can be eaten, and His blood drunk before coming to the Lord's Supper, appears to *have been believed every where, always, and by all*; and it is the plain doctrine of Holy Scripture. Our Lord says: 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His 'blood, ye have no life in you' (ver. 53). Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey, and their school, confine this statement to a real reception of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. They understand our Lord's words as if He had said, 'Except ye 'eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood sacramentally in the Eucharist, ye have no life in you.' If these doctors are right in their interpretation, we ought to conclude that life could be obtained in no other way. Yet nowhere in the New Testament is life promised to a participation of the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, while the same blessing is constantly promised to faith and repentance. There are many such instances in this very gospel, (John iii.

15, 16, 18, 36 ; iv. 14 ; v. 24, 40 ; vi. 40, 47 ; xx. 31.) We justly conclude, then, that our Lord, in the words in question, could not necessarily mean a sacramental participation of His body and blood.

46. Again our Lord says : 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him,' (ver. 56). Augustine, on these words, has well remarked : 'The Lord here showeth what it is to eat the body of Christ and drink His blood ; not as to the sacrament only, but in reality ; that is, to dwell in Christ, so that Christ also should dwell in him. For He hath so said this, as though he said, "Whoso dwelleth not in me, and in whom I dwell not, let him not say or think that he eateth my flesh or drinketh my blood."' (21 34.) Again he says, on the words, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him : ' 'The sign which shows that one hath eaten and drunk is this,—if he indwelleth, and is dwelt in ; if he inhabiteth, and is inhabited ; if he cleaveth, that he be not abandoned. This, then, it is that He hath taught and admonished us in mystical words, that we be in His body, under Himself the Head—in His members eating His flesh, not forsaking the unity of Him.' (21 86.) Our venerable Bede quoted the same with approval in the eighth century. (24 18.)

47. There is much that is truly painful in Dr Wiseman's interpretation of this sixth chapter of St John, and we entertain doubt whether he himself believed his own interpretation. For if he really did believe it, how could he belong to a church which, as late as the fifteenth century, made a law that no layman should receive the blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. He avows that he takes our blessed Lord's words literally, who says, 'Except ye drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you.' (ver. 53.) ; and yet, contrary to the Lord's solemn declaration, is a party to withholding the blood, or the cup which represented it, from the laity.

48. Beyond all question the participation of Christ's body and blood, in this chapter, is spiritual, and not sacramental, and is by faith, without the symbols of bread and wine. We

fully admit, however, that there is an implied, if not a direct, reference to the Lord's Supper ; but then it is not in any way to the symbols which signify or represent in that holy ordinance, but rather to that which is signified or represented by them.

49. Men who are not Romanists, and not exactly Romanizers, because we do not admit that in this chapter there is an exclusive reference to the Lord's Supper, represent us as if we did not admit any reference at all. Canon Trevor is a case in point. He remarks : ' Unfortunately the fullest and ' most didactic piece of the whole has been altogether diverted ' from the subject by the forced interpretations of the sixteenth ' century. The early church never doubted the Eucharistic ' application of the discourse in John vi. It was questioned ' by Luther and Calvin from an apprehension that the value ' it would ascribe to the sacrament might be detrimental to ' their views of the great doctrine of justification by faith.' (*Sacrifice and Participation of the Holy Eucharist*, pp. 113, 114.) In answer to this loose and vague statement, it is only necessary to let Calvin speak for himself, who displays an intimate knowledge of the doctrine of the early church upon the point in question. In his commentary, on the part of the chapter we are examining, he states :—

' From these words it plainly appears that the whole of this passage is improperly explained, as applied to the Lord's Supper. For ' if it were true that all who present themselves at the holy table of ' the Lord are made partakers of His flesh and blood, all will, in like ' manner, obtain *life* ; but we know that there are many who partake ' of it to their condemnation. And, indeed, it would have been foolish ' and unreasonable to discourse about the Lord's Supper before He ' had instituted it. It is certain, then, that he now speaks of the ' perpetual and ordinary manner of eating the flesh of Christ, which ' is done by faith only. And yet, at the same time, I acknowledge ' that there is nothing said here that is not figuratively represented, ' and actually bestowed on believers, in the Lord's Supper ; and Christ ' even intended that the holy Supper should be, as it were, a seal and ' confirmation of this sermon. This is also the reason why the Evangelist John makes no mention of the Lord's Supper ; and, therefore, ' Augustine follows the natural order when, in explaining this chapter, ' he does not touch on the Lord's Supper till he comes to the conclusion ; and then He shows that this mystery is symbolically represented whenever the churches celebrate the Lord's Supper, in

'some places daily, and in other places only on the Lord's Day.'—
(*Comment. on John.*)

50. Not only has Dr Wiseman failed to prove his doctrine of the Lord's Supper from this sixth chapter of St John, but he has not interpreted it in accordance with the early Fathers, but exactly against them. Now, Dr Wiseman, Dr Pusey, and their school, profess according to a most stringent rule to interpret God's Word as from old it has been interpreted, but, instead of this, they propound new interpretations invented by themselves, at variance with the general teaching of Scripture as received by the Catholic Church. (Ch. i. 15-22.)

51. It will be now shown that the Fathers generally have, by anticipation, plainly contradicted Dr Wiseman in his interpretation of the sixth chapter of St John, as given 34 1-6, and have distinctly confirmed the teaching of those whom Dr Wiseman undertook to prove to be in error. The citations we are about to make from the Fathers will be given in the order in which they occur in their works, and as given in our *Catena*.

52. Ignatius says, 'Wherefore, clothing yourselves with meekness, be ye renewed in faith, that is the flesh of the Lord, and in love, that is the blood of Jesus Christ.' (3 3.) 'I desire the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who became afterwards of the seed of David and Abraham; and I desire the drink of God, namely, His blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life.' (3 4.) Nearly all the Fathers so interpret this sixth of St John as to show that they did not consider that there was necessarily a sacramental eating in order to participate of Christ's flesh and blood, or that any eating by the mouth was required. It is plain, from the above language, that Ignatius did not. But this is exactly the opposite of Dr Wiseman's teaching. (34 1-6.)

53. Clement of Alexandria teaches, 'Faith . . . which being more substantial than hearing, is likened to meat, and assimilates to the soul itself, nourishment of this kind. Elsewhere, the Lord in the Gospel according to St John, brought this out by symbols when He said, "Eat ye my flesh, and drink my blood," describing distinctly by metaphor the

‘drinkable properties of faith.’ (9 1, 2.) ‘Hear it (the food of Christ’s flesh and blood) also in the following way. The flesh figuratively represents to us the Holy Spirit,’ &c. (9 4.) Thus, in many ways the Word is figuratively represented as meat and flesh, and food, and bread, and blood, and milk. The Lord is all these to give enjoyment to us who have believed on Him. Let no one then think it strange when we say that the Lord’s blood is figuratively represented as milk. For is it not figuratively represented as wine? . . . The same blood and milk of the Lord is therefore the symbol of ‘the Lord’s passion and teaching.’ (9 5.) Dr Wiseman contends that the Jews and [modern Roman] Catholics are right in taking our Lord’s words literally, and Protestants are wrong who understand them figuratively. (34 6.) It is certain that Clement understood them figuratively.

54. Tertullian well says, ‘The sense must be guided from the occasion of the discourse. For because they thought His saying hard and intolerable, as if He had determined His flesh to be eaten by them. . . . Appointing, therefore, the Word to be the vivifier, because the Word is spirit and life, He calleth the same likewise “His own flesh,” for since the “Word was made flesh,” it was thence to be sought for the purpose of life, and was to be devoured in the hearing, and was to be ruminated upon in the intellect, and was to be digested by faith. Hence, He had shortly before pronounced His to be heavenly bread.’ (10 6.) In these few words from Tertullian, we have a direct contradiction of nearly all that Dr Wiseman has affirmed and denied in regard to the interpretation of our Lord’s words. (34 1-6.)

55. Origen states,

‘That as the Word of God is drinkable, to some, indeed, It is water, but to some It is “wine that maketh glad the heart of man:” and to others, It is blood on account of that, “Except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you.” But it is also called food, not because it is considered to be living bread and flesh.’ (11 1.) ‘It is necessary to eat the flesh of this lamb, &c. . . . for the Word of God is not flesh only. Therefore, He says, “I am that bread of life,” &c. (John vi. 48, 50, 51.) Yet it should be known that all food is, by a more improper use, called bread; as by Moses it is written in Deuteronomy, “During forty days he did eat no bread and drink no water.” (Deut. ix. 9.) Before this, he neither partook of dry nor moist

'food. I have noticed this, because John says in his gospel, "And "the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life "of the world." (11 2.) 'The Jews were not so foolish as to suppose 'that when saying these things Christ invites the hearers to come and 'eat His flesh.' (11 3.)

After giving some account of Christ's body in the Eucharist, which he calls a 'typical and symbolical body,' he proceeds,

'But many things might be spoken concerning the Word Himself 'also who became flesh and true food, which he who eats shall certainly live for ever; no wicked man being able to eat it. For if it 'were possible that any one living in sin could eat Him who became 'flesh, being the Word and Living Bread, it would not have been 'written, that "every one who eateth this bread shall live for ever." (11 5, 6.) Celebrating *spiritually*, we fulfil all those things, which 'are commanded to be celebrated corporally. For we put away the 'heaven of malice and wickedness, and we celebrate the Passover with 'the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth when Christ feasts with 'us according to the will of the Lamb, saying, "Except ye eat my 'flesh and drink my blood, ye shall have "no life in you," (11 8.) 'Nor do thou marvel because the Word of God is also called flesh and 'bread, and is called milk, and is called herbs, and for the capacity 'of believers, or the possibility of their receiving Him, He is 'diversely named. He filled believers with bread . . . that He 'Himself may be the bread of the gospel. (11 21.) Our Lord and 'Saviour says, "Except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye "have no life in you, for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is "drink indeed." (John vi. 53, 55.) Because Jesus therefore is 'altogether and wholly clean, His whole flesh is food, and His whole 'blood is drink, because every work of Him is holy, and every word 'of Him is true. And therefore His flesh is true food, and His 'blood is true drink. For with the flesh and blood of His own Word 'as with clean food and drink, He gives drink to, and recruits the 'whole race of men. In the second place, after the flesh of Him, 'Peter is clean food, and Paul, and all the apostles. . . . Acknowledge that they are figures which are written in the Inspired Book; 'and therefore, as spiritual and not as carnal persons, examine and 'understand what is said. For, if as carnal persons, you understand 'them, they injure, and do not nourish you. For there is also in the 'Gospel a letter which kills; a killing letter is not found in the Old 'Testament alone. There is also in the New Testament a letter which 'kills him, who does not understand spiritually the things which are 'spoken. For if, according to the letter, thou followest the very thing 'which is said, "Except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood," this 'letter killeth. (11 28, 29.) But he who shall have tasted the bread, 'which cometh down from heaven, shall not die, but remain to life 'eternal. For this is the bread, which, since it may always be eaten, 'always remains, yea, always increases. It is therefore, as the apostle

'says, "spiritual meat," which the more it is taken, the more it increases. (11 33.) Who can eat flesh and drink blood? But the Christian people, the faithful people, heareth these things and embraceth them, and followeth Him who saith, "Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye have no life in you; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." And he who said these things was wounded for men; for "He was wounded for our sins," as Isaiah says. But we are said to drink the blood of Christ not only in the way of sacraments, but also when we receive His words in which is life as also Himself saith: "The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit" "and they are life." He, therefore, Himself has been wounded whose blood we drink, that is, we receive the words of His doctrine. . . . Thou, then, art the true people of Israel, which canst drink blood, and canst eat the flesh of the Word of God, and drink His blood, and canst suck up the blood of that grape which is of the true vine, and of those branches which the Father purgeth. The fruit of these branches is deservedly called the blood of those who are wounded, which we drink from their words and doctrine.' (11 34, 35, 36.)

56. Again he says,

'Let the Jews in a carnal sense eat the flesh of the lamb, but let us eat the flesh of the Word of God. For He Himself said, "Except ye eat my flesh, ye have no life in you." That which we only speak is the flesh of the Word of God; if, at least, we do not, as it were, offer herbs to the weak, or milk for babes. If we speak what is perfect, what is healthy, what is strong, we place before you the flesh of the Word of God to eat. (11 37.) The Saviour says, "I am the bread which came down from heaven." This bread, then, angels did indeed formerly eat, but now also men. To eat, signifies there, to know; for the mind eats that which it knows, and does not eat that which it does not know. (11 41.) There is therefore a meat and drink of this material man, which is also called the outer man, suitable to its nature, to wit, that which is corporeal and earthly. And in like manner also, there is an appropriate meat of that spiritual man which is called the inner man, as that living bread which came down from heaven. But there is also that drink of that water which Jesus promised, saying, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst." Thus, therefore, in all things there is used a similarity of phrases as it respects both the inward and the outward man: but the property of the things is preserved unmixed to each, and to that which is corruptible, corruptible things are given, and to that which is incorruptible, incorruptible things are offered. (11 43.) Therefore He is also called the true Light that the eyes of the soul may have that by which they may be enlightened: therefore, also He is called the Word, that the ears may have that which they may hear; therefore, also He is called the Bread of life, that the taste of the soul may have what it may taste.' (11 44.)

57. A more complete and comprehensive answer could not

well be given to the sentiments of Dr Wiseman, as recorded in **34** 1-6. Does he there confound what is spiritual with what is not so, and what is figurative with what is literal? Origen has guarded against such a mistake. He employs strong figurative language, but he very distinctly interprets its meaning. It should be observed, that in some of the above citations from him, he employs the phrase, 'The Word,' not only as a title of the Lord Jesus, but also of the Holy Scriptures. So that, according to Origen, Christ can be received by the written or spoken Word, as well as by the sacrament. He has not only interpreted our Lord's words, but has given us also correct principles of interpretation by which alone they must be interpreted. The reader will not fail to see the value and importance of this testimony against the bold assumptions and daring misinterpretations of Dr Wiseman and those of his school.

58. Eusebius, after citing John vi. 35, 41-53, 55, 62, 63, states,

'By which words He instructs them to understand spiritually, the words that he had spoken concerning flesh and blood; for you must not consider me to speak of the flesh which I carry about me, as if you were to eat that; nor suppose that I command you to drink sensible and corporal blood. But understand well, that the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life; so that His words and discourses are the flesh and blood of which he who always partakes, as one fed upon heavenly food, shall be a partaker of heavenly life. Therefore let not, He says, this offend you, that I have spoken of the eating of my flesh, and the drinking of my blood; nor let the bare hearing of the things spoken by me concerning flesh and blood disturb you: for these things profit nothing, if apprehended according to sense. But it is the spirit that quickens those able to apprehend them spiritually.' (14 5, 6.)

In all points in which Dr Wiseman charges Protestants with being wrong in their interpretations of John vi., according to this plain testimony of Eusebius, they are right, and wherein he maintains that Roman Catholics are right, this same witness testifies that they are wrong.

59. Cyril of Jerusalem states, 'Christ on a certain occasion discoursing with the Jews, said, "Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye have no life in you." They not hearing spiritually the things spoken, were offended, and went backward, supposing that He was inviting them to eat flesh.'

(15 12.) Dr Wiseman considers the Jews were right in their supposition, and that Roman Catholics are right in supposing the same thing, and that Protestants are wrong for not doing so likewise. (34 6.) So did not Eusebius think.

60. Basil teaches 'that there is a certain spiritual mouth 'of the inner man, by which he is nourished, receiving the 'Word of life, which is the bread that came down from heaven.'

(16 1.) On the words, 'Taste and see how sweet the Lord 'is,' (Ps. xxxiv. 8) he remarks.

'We have observed in many places, that the faculties of the soul are 'called by the same names as the external members of the body, and 'since our Lord is the true bread, and His flesh the true meat, it is 'necessary that the pleasure and joy derived from that bread should 'accrue to us through a mental taste.' (16 2.) 'There is need next, 'that we be nourished with the food of eternal life, and which very 'food also the only begotten Son of the living God hath given to us, 'when He says, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every "'word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God." . . . And again, 'to confirm those things which He brought forward, and to persuade 'the hearers, He added, "Verily I say unto you, except ye eat the "'flesh," &c. (John vi. 53-56, and 60-68.) What then are these words 'useful for? That eating and drinking we always keep in remembrance Him who died for us, and rose again, and that we be so necessarily established to keep before God and His Christ the doctrine 'given by the apostle.' (16 4.)

On the words, 'He that eateth me, even he shall live by me,' (John vi. 57), he states, 'For we eat His flesh and drink His 'blood by being made partakers through His incarnation and 'life of sense of the Word and wisdom. For He called His 'whole mystical course and conversation on earth His flesh 'and blood, and signified by them that doctrine consisting of 'practical, and natural, and theological teaching by which the 'soul is nourished and is prepared for the contemplation of 'things.' (16 9.) Certainly nothing could be more contradictory to the teaching of Dr Wiseman, as recorded 34 1-6. Basil, like Origen, lays down a rule of interpretation which well applies to such figurative language as that of the sixth of St John.

61. Ambrose.

'For we have the true bread, that bread which came down from 'heaven. He eats that bread who keeps those things which

'have been written.' (17 12) 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven. (John vi. 51). Of which bread the prophet says, "And bread which strengtheneth man's heart." . . . For he neglects the hunger of the body who increases the food of reading. Nor can he regard the stomach who receives the nourishment of the heavenly Word ; for it is the very nourishment which feeds the soul, which fattens the inward powers, when we receive the food of the never-failing eloquence from the divine Scriptures. It is the very food which gives eternal life, and drives from us the snares of diabolical temptation. But that the reading of the Holy writings is life, the Lord witnesses saying, "The words which I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life." (17 17.) 'We too may understand the Lord Himself who giveth His own flesh to us, as He Himself said, "I am the bread of life," &c. . . . For he receiveth who proveth Himself, but whoso receiveth shall not die the sinner's death ; for this bread is the remission of sins.' (17 3.)

Contrary to Dr Wiseman, Ambrose in our second extract from him has interpreted a part of the sixth of St John figuratively and spiritually, which Dr Wiseman interprets literally, the one that Christ the bread of life can be received by the reading of the Scriptures, the other only by the literal eating of the natural mouth. The last extract most certainly relates not to a sacramental eating, and therefore not a literal eating by the natural mouth ; so that according to the express teaching of Ambrose, contrary to Dr Wiseman, the flesh of Christ can be eaten apart from the sacrament. The reader will see by referring to 17 2, 3, that Ambrose gives two interpretations to the blessing of Asher ; one relating to Christ under the aspect of bread in the sacrament, and the other personally to Christ Himself as the bread of life not necessarily in the sacrament.

62. This part of the writings of Ambrose, which in our edition of his works appears in one paragraph, Dr Pusey has cited in two paragraphs, accompanied by two distinct and independent references. His readers, and especially those who accept him as their teacher, might infer that in both instances Ambrose was referring to a sacramental eating, and so would be misled.

63. Jerome.

'And the hunger of the Jewish people to hear the Word of God, satisfied with "that bread which came down from heaven." (John vi. 58. 18. 30.) 'For they did eat in the holy Scriptures "the

“bread which came down from heaven.” (18 40.) ‘We pollute bread, that is the body of Christ, &c.’ . . . On the other hand, we can say a teacher of the Church who makes spiritual bread, &c.’ (18 47, 48.) ‘Since the flesh of the Lord is true food, and His blood is true drink (John vi. 55), the spiritual meaning is, that in this present life we have one only good, to feed on His flesh and to drink his blood, not only in the mystery [the Eucharist], but also in the reading of the Scriptures. For the true food and drink which is derived from the Word of God, is knowledge of the Scriptures.’ (18 49.) ‘I think that the Gospel is the body of Jesus, that the Holy Scriptures are His doctrine. And since He says, “He who doth not eat my flesh and drink my blood,” although also it can be understood in the mystery [Eucharist] yet more truly is the word of the Scriptures—the divine doctrine, the body of Christ and His blood. . . . If when we hear the Word of God, the Word of God, and the flesh of Christ and His blood are poured into our ears, and we are thinking of something else, &c.” . . . So also in the flesh of Christ which is the word of doctrine, that is, the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.’ (18 50-52.) ‘When we pray God to give us our peculiar or chief bread, we mean Him who says in the Gospel, “I am the living bread which came down from heaven.”’ (18 53.) ‘But now by this same opinion he teaches that the spiritual bread of the Church, “which came down from heaven” (John vi. 58), ought not to be injured by Jewish interpretation.’ (18 60). ‘But in two ways are the blood and flesh of Christ understood either that spiritual and divine, whereof He Himself said, “My flesh is meat indeed, “and my blood is drink indeed;” and “Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye shall not have eternal life;” or the flesh and blood, the flesh which was crucified, the blood which was shed by the soldiers’ spear.’ (18 62). For two other instances see 18 27, 29.

64. Jerome was by far the most able biblical scholar of all the Latin Fathers and probably of the Greek also, Origen not excepted. His excellent Latin version of the Holy Scriptures is received as authentic if not as infallible by the Roman Church. The testimony of Jerome, therefore, should be of peculiar value to Romanists, especially so, if as in this case his teaching is in harmony with the early Catholic Church generally. But could any testimony be more fatal to the teaching of Dr Wiseman as recorded 34 1-6, and to all who interpret any part of the sixth of St John, as exclusively referring to a sacramental eating of Christ’s flesh and blood? Such authors, for instance, as Dr Wordsworth the Bishop of Lincoln, and Dr Browne the Bishop of Ely. Dr Wiseman maintains that as far as the 48th verse of the chapter, Christ

is speaking of a spiritual participation of Himself by faith in His words or teaching, and not by the mouth in the sacrament, but from the 48th verse, He makes a transition from the doctrine of believing in Himself to the doctrine of a real eating of Himself by the natural mouth in the sacrament of the Eucharist. (34 1-6). But this latter part of the chapter which Dr Wiseman rigidly confines to a literal eating of Christ, Jerome almost in every one of the above extracts, collected from various parts of his writings, teaches that this participation of Christ may be obtained by hearing the Word of God, that Christ the bread of life may be eaten in the Scriptures; that a believer may feed on the flesh and blood of Christ in the reading of the Scriptures; that the true meat and drink is knowledge of the Scriptures; that the Gospel is the body of Christ; that more truly is the word of the Scriptures the body of Christ than the sacrament or mystery of the Lord's Supper is, which is commonly called His body; that the flesh of Christ is the word of doctrine; and that the bread which came down from heaven is the spiritual bread of the Church, and is not to be injured by Jewish teaching. Jerome was so far from believing that the Jews rightly understood our Lord in teaching that they must literally eat His flesh and drink his blood in order to have life, and that all His disciples ought so to understand Him (34 6), he actually maintains that the flesh and blood of Christ may be understood in two ways, that is, literally and materially; figuratively, and spiritually, and in proof of the latter he cites those parts of the sixth of St John which Dr Wiseman interprets literally as relating to the eating and drinking of Christ's actual flesh and blood.

65. Gaudentius.

‘That you think not like the Jew, that it is raw flesh, and raw blood, and reject, saying, “How can this man give us His flesh to eat?” . . . Therefore, when He spake of eating His flesh, and drinking His blood, to the multitudes, amazed and muttering, “This is a hard saying, who can hear it?” He, that He might by heavenly fire do away those thoughts, which I told you were to be avoided, added, “It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.” . . . For truly this is the hereditary gift of His New Testament, which

‘He left us in that night when he was betrayed to be crucified, as a pledge of His presence. This is that food for our journey, whereby in this journey of life we are fed and nourished, until departing from this world, we go forth unto Himself. Whence the Lord Himself said, “Except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you.” For He willed His benefits to abide with us. He willed our souls ever to be sanctified by His precious blood, through the image of His own passion.’ (19 8-10.)

Gaudentius does not with Dr Wiseman, commend the Jews for their carnal notions respecting the eating of Christ, but repudiates them, and rather with those whom Dr Wiseman calls opponents, understands our Lord’s words spiritually.

66. Ruffinus.

‘They who hungered and thirsted after righteousness are alone fed with the Divine Scriptures, are refreshed with the heavenly sacraments. Let them praise, who seek Him; for it is the praise of the Lord, the utterance of His satisfaction. Whence their hearts live for ever, because that is the meat of the heart and soul, of which it is written, “If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever,” and blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be satisfied. “For man lives not on bread alone, but on every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”’ (20 7.) ‘What food? Doubtless of that which Himself says, “I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.” But how did He prepare this bread for us? The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. . . . For neither could either Paul, or the Prophets, or an angel prepare such great food, but only the mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus. There is also the Sacred Scriptures, food prepared for us by the Lord.’ (20 10.)

This learned presbyter by anticipation has borne testimony against the Romanists.

67. Augustine.

‘1. If a form of speech is preceptive, forbidding either a disgraceful thing or a crime, or commanding what is useful or beneficent, it is not figurative. But if it seems to command a disgraceful thing or a crime, or to forbid what is useful or beneficent, it is figurative. “Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you.” He seems to command a disgraceful thing or a crime, therefore it is figurative, commanding us to communicate in the passion of the Lord, and sweetly and profitably to treasure up in our memory, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us.’ (21 13.)
 ‘2. It has been called, “daily bread,” either for all those things which sustain the necessities of life, respecting which He orders, saying, “take

"no thought for the morrow," so that it might be added, "give to us
 "this day," either for the sacrament of the body of Christ, which we
 receive daily; or for spiritual food, of which the same Lord says,
 "Labour for the meat which is not corrupted." And again, "I am
 "the bread of life which came down from heaven." But of these
 three, that which is most probable can be considered. . . . But as
 they, who are very numerous in the Eastern parts, do not agitate the
 question concerning the sacrament of the Lord's body, nor do they
 communicate daily in the Lord's Supper, although this has been
 called daily bread. . . . It remains, therefore, that by "daily," we
 understand spiritual bread, namely, the divine precepts which daily
 we ought to contemplate and practice. . . . But if any one wishes to
 understand those things which concern the necessary food of the
 body, or that opinion concerning the sacrament of the Lord's body,
 it is necessary that all three be conjointly understood, that is to say,
 let us seek at the same time, bread necessary for the body, and also
 the visible and invisible sacrament of the Word of God. (21 27.)
 3. For righteousness is bread. Who is bread? "I am the living
 "bread which came down from heaven." Himself is the bread of
 our heart. (21 52.) 4. It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh pro-
 fiteth nothing. But when the Lord counselled this He had been
 speaking of His own flesh, and He said, "Except a man eat my flesh,
 "he shall have no life in him." Some disciples of His were offended
 and said, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" And they went
 back and walked no more with Him. It seemed unto them hard
 that He said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ye have
 "no life in you." They received it foolishly, they thought of it car-
 nally, and imagined that the Lord would cut off parts from His body
 and give unto them; and they said, "This is a hard saying." . . .
 For when twelve disciples had remained with Him. . . . He instructed
 them, and saith unto them, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the
 "flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are
 "spirit and they are life." Understand spiritually what I have said;
 ye are not to eat this body which ye see; nor to drink that blood
 which they who will crucify me shall pour forth. I have commended
 unto you a certain sacrament spiritually understood, it will quicken.
 Although it is needful that this be visibly celebrated, yet it must be
 spiritually understood. (21 58, 59.) 5. That it may bring forth bread
 out of the earth. What bread? Christ. Out of what earth? From
 Peter, from Paul, from the other stewards of the truth. Hear that
 it is from the earth: "We have," he saith, this treasure in earthen
 "vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of
 "us." He is the bread who descended from heaven, that He might be
 brought forth out of the earth, when He is preached through the flesh
 of His servants. . . . "Blessed are they," saith our Lord, "who hunger
 "and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." That bread is
 righteousness, that wine is righteousness; it is truth, Christ is truth.
 "I am," he said, "the living bread who came down from heaven;" and

“I am the vine, and ye are the branches.” (21 60, 61.) 6. This is the work of God that ye believe on Him whom he hath sent. This then is to eat, “not that meat which perisheth, but that which remaineth unto eternal life.” Why make ready the teeth and belly? Believe and thou hast eaten. (21 69.) 7. The Lord then being about to give the Holy Spirit, said that He was the bread which came down from heaven, exhorting us to believe on Him. For to believe on Him, this is to eat the living bread. He that believeth eateth. (21 72.) 8. For they thought He would deal out to them His own body; but He said that he would ascend into heaven, of course, entire. When “ye shall see the Son of man ascending where he was before,” certainly then, at least ye will see that not in the way ye think doth He deal out His body, certainly then at least you will understand that His grace is not consumed by bites. . . . It is the Spirit, then, that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; so as those Jews understood the flesh, not so give I my flesh to be eaten. (21 87, 88.) 9. The same who in their rage had killed Him being changed, believed in Him, and the blood which in their raging they had shed by believing they drunk. (21 93.) 10. Many of them believed, and the shedding of the blood of Christ was forgiven them. At first they shed it while they raged; now they drank it while they believed. (21 103.) 11. “Blessed are they who eat bread in the kingdom of God.” He sighed as though after distant things, and the Bread Himself was sitting down before him. Who is the bread of the kingdom of God? but He who saith, “I am the living bread which came down from heaven.” Do not get thy jaws ready, but thine heart. . . . It is not then what is seen, but what is believed that feeds us. (21 105.) 12. What meaneth this? “Doth this offend you?” Do you imagine that I am about to make parts of this my body which ye see; and to cut up my members, and give them to you? “What if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before?” Assuredly, He who could ascend whole, could not be consumed.’ (21 107.)

68. Probably no ten Fathers in the early Latin Church as theologians ever had so much influence and authority as Augustine. It is strange how in more modern times, with changes in doctrine has come a change of doctors. In the modern Roman Church the name of Augustine is retained, but other doctors, in regard to the teaching on the Lord's Supper have taken his place. His mantle, however, although cast off by Roman doctors, was gracefully worn by the Reformers, both English and Continental, and he, more than all the doctors of the early Church, was employed in successfully answering the modern Roman doctors. The difference between the interpretation of a part of the sixth of St John by Dr Wise-

man and his school, and that of Augustine on the same subject, which we have now to notice, could not well be greater.

69. Our very first extract from Augustine, taken as it stands in the order of his writings, is a complete answer to Dr Wiseman's peculiar teaching on the sixth of St John. Its force and bearing on the present point is noticed elsewhere. (Ch. viii. 50). It is cited very prominently by Bertram and Rabanus Maurus, and by the former against Paschasius. (25 18, 19; 26 30).

70. In the second extract Augustine makes an essential distinction between sacramental bread and spiritual bread—that the one was not the other, and that one could be taken without the other. Augustine suggests these interpretations to the phrase 'daily bread,' viz., Food for the body;—Bread for the sacrament of Christ's body, that is, for a sacred sign of it;—and spiritual Food, explained to be Christ the Bread of life, and divine precepts. In summing up his remarks he considers it necessary that all three be conjointly understood, that is bread for the body, and also the visible and invisible sacrament of the Word of God. As explained above, the visible sacrament is the sacred sign of Christ's body, the invisible sacrament is the spiritual Bread or Food, that is Christ the Bread of life, here called the Word of God, and is also the Divine Precepts which are the written or spoken Word of God. This spiritual bread, which is Christ the Bread of life, may be received in the visible sacrament, and also without the visible sacrament in the Divine Precepts. But as Augustine teaches elsewhere, in either case only can the Bread of life be received spiritually, and in neither otherwise. We shall not rightly understand Augustine here and elsewhere, and also the Fathers generally, unless as much as possible we put ourselves into their position, and judge of their statements from their own point of view. Augustine regarded sacraments as being much the same in use as the spoken Word of God, hence he calls them visible words. (21 10, 39, 101). Herein he was followed by the Reformers generally—for instance, Zwingli (29 13). Calvin (30 7, 24), Cranmer (31 9), and Jewel (32 8).

71. In the third and fifth extracts it is plain that in the mind of Augustine the same Bread of life given *in* the sacra-

ment can be given *out* of it, and can be eaten without any sacramental eating, simply by faith, as he plainly teaches, which may be seen in the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh extracts, and in the sacrament cannot be received without faith, as he teaches elsewhere.

72. Dr Wiseman states ‘that whenever our Lord’s hearers ‘found difficulties, or raised objections to His words, from taking ‘them in their literal sense, while He intended them to be ‘taken figuratively, His constant practice was to explain them ‘instantly, in a figurative manner.’ (34 7). He assumes that, on this occasion, our Lord did not explain His words, and that the Jews understood as He intended, and as all should now understand His language; but mark the difference between Augustine, a real Catholic doctor, and Dr Wiseman, a modern Roman one. In the fourth extract we see that Augustine teaches the very opposite of Dr Wiseman, for he plainly states that our Lord did explain spiritually to the twelve disciples the words at which the disciples generally had been offended and had understood carnally. Augustine, contrary to Dr Wiseman, also considered that the Jews had misunderstood our Lord’s words, as is plain from the first, fourth, eighth, and twelfth extracts. That Augustine did not believe, as Dr Wiseman teaches (34 1, 2) that, in the first part of our Lord’s discourse, He, the Bread from heaven, [namely, His doctrines] might be received by faith, but that in the second part He taught a literal eating of Himself by the natural mouth in the Eucharist, is quite certain from the above extracts. In fact, nothing could be more directly opposed to Dr Wiseman.

73. Chrysostom :

‘Art thou made a sinner? He is made to thee a lamb. “Behold the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.” Dost thou wish to eat? He is made to thee a table. Dost thou wish to drink? He is made to thee a cup. “He that eateth “my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him.”’ (John vi. 56 ; 22 3). He calls Himself “the bread of life” (John ‘vi. 48), because He maintaineth our life, both which is and which is ‘to be, and saith, “Whosoever shall eat of this bread shall live for ‘“ever” (v. 58). By “bread” He meaneth here either His saving ‘doctrines, and the faith which is in Him, or His own body, for both ‘nerve the soul. Yet, in another place, He said, “If a man hear my

“saying he shall never taste of death” (22 13). “It is the Spirit
 “that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing” (John vi. 63). His
 ‘meaning is, Ye must hear spiritually what relateth to me, for he who
 ‘heareth carnally is not profited nor gathereth any advantage. . . .
 ‘They ought to have understood the matter in a mystical and spiritual
 ‘sense’ (22 14).

74. Chrysostom, like the rest of the Fathers, has rebuked Dr Wiseman by anticipation. The very part of the sixth of St John which he interprets literally, Chrysostom places amongst other metaphors which to understand literally, according to Augustine and Ælfrie, would be blasphemy (21 122; 27 4). That part of the chapter which Dr Wiseman maintains should be understood as teaching a literal eating of Christ, Chrysostom considers it may mean the reception of ‘His saving doctrines;’ and so far from thinking that the Jews rightly understood Christ, he states that ‘they ought to have understood Him spiritually and mystically,’ and not carnally. Here Chrysostom is with the Protestants, and is exactly against those whom Dr Wiseman calls Catholics. (34 6).

CHAPTER VIII.

THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS AS FIRST INTRODUCED BY PASCHASIUS, REFUTED BY BERTRAM, AND PARTLY BY RABANUS MAURUS : WITH A VIEW OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE BEFORE THE CONTROVERSY AROSE, AS RECORDED IN THE WRITINGS OF RABANUS MAURUS, AND MORE ESPECIALLY IN THOSE OF BEDE, THE MOST FAMOUS DIVINE IN THE AGE IN WHICH HE LIVED, AND WHO COMPILED A COMMENTARY TAKEN OUT OF THE WRITINGS OF AUGUSTINE. FROM THIS, COPIOUS COMMENTS ARE CITED, MORE ESPECIALLY ON THOSE TEXTS CONNECTED WITH THE CONTROVERSY, AND FROM WHICH MAY BE SEEN NOT ONLY THE SENTIMENTS OF BEDE ON THE DOCTRINE IN QUESTION, BUT ALSO THOSE OF AUGUSTINE.

1. WE now enter upon a more especial examination of the leading Fathers of the first eight centuries in regard to the doctrines in dispute. But at what point are we to enter this immense field of inquiry? It is admitted by all, that there was no controversy upon the subject for 800 years, until towards the middle of the ninth century. All things considered perhaps it is most suitable to begin with those authors who lived immediately before, or in the time of, the controversy. Of these, by far the more important are Bede, Bertram, and Rabanus Maurus. Bede lived before the controversy, and from him more than from any other Christian divine of his age can we learn the doctrine of the sacraments. After having examined these, which we shall do in the following order—Bertram, Rabanus Maurus, and Bede—the reader will be better prepared to appreciate the general testimony of the leading witnesses of an earlier date, which we shall have more especially to examine in our answer to Dr Pusey's challenge. Paschasius first introduced the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, and produced a great sensation among the divines of those days, several of whom ably and conclusively refuted the doctrine. Two of these were Bertram and Rabanus Maurus, whose testimony is adduced in our *catena patrum*. (25 26.) Bellarmine, however, against all authority, and without any proof whatever

represents Bertram as the heretic, and Paschasius as the defender of the true doctrine. He says, 'This author was the first who wrote seriously and copiously, on the reality of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, against Bertram a presbyter, who was one of the chief of those who called it in doubt.' (*De Scrip. Eccle. de Pasc.* 820. Opera tom. vii. f. 121.) The facts of the case are the very reverse, as the beginning and end of Bertram's treatise shows. (Sec. 25 1-3, 62.) Neander states the facts as follow :—

'Some time after the year 844 Paschasius Radbert, dedicated to King Charles the Bald, as a Christmas gift, a second edition of his work on the Holy Supper, better adapted to popular use, requesting him to favour its spread; and that monarch perceiving the diversity of opinion on this subject among the learned, sought counsel of Ratramnus (Bertram) the monk of Corbie, who was thus led to write his work, "On the Body and Blood of the Lord." Without mentioning the name of Paschasius, who was his own Abbot, and whom therefore he could not decently offend, he entered immediately in this book, into the investigation of two questions, strictly connected with Paschasius' doctrine of the Holy Supper.' These questions are stated 25 1-3.

2. We are now about to examine the doctrine of Paschasius respecting the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, and to show that Dr Pusey, whether knowingly or not, is in effect a disciple of Paschasius, so that what is often called Puseyism, would be more correctly called Paschasianism, though less euphonious, yet more ancient by about 1000 years.

3. Dr Pusey states, 'Mr Goode has ridiculed my belief that in the Holy Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ are present, yet not after the manner of a body, but as I have often repeated "spiritually, sacramentally, divinely, mystically, "ineffably, through the operation of the Word of Christ, and "of God the Holy Ghost." The same doctrine is repeatedly stated by Bertram, to whom Ridley and Cranmer frequently referred, and whose disciples they wished to be. . . . Bertram, in his answer [to Charles the Bald], asserts most distinctly the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, but *that*, with the very distinction, which I have taught, of a spiritual Body, yet not received after the manner of a body.' (*The Real Presence, &c., the Doctrine of the*

English Church, pp. 204, 205.) Dr Pusey then quotes a passage from Bertram which will be found 25 10. He further states, 'yet Bertram, who repeatedly insists on the Real Presence, and that what we receive in the Holy Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ, insists also that the Body is a "spiritual Body," and is present "not corporally,"—or after the manner of a body. He is commenting on a passage of 'S. Ambrose.' (*Ibid.* p. 206.) Here follows a passage from Bertram which will be found. (25 33-37.) After quoting this passage, Dr Pusey asserts, 'Paschasius Radbertus, (with whom Bertram has been so often popularly contrasted, and against whom he has ever been supposed to have written) uses the same language.' (*Ibid.* p. 208.) Here follows an extract from Paschasius, which will be found. (33 27.)

4. In what we have here quoted from Dr Pusey, we have two untruthful statements and two deceptive ones. He says, 'Bertram asserts most distinctly the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ.' The plain truth is, he *denies* 'most distinctly the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements. Dr Pusey affirms, 'Bertram repeatedly insists on the Real Presence.' The fact is, he insists on the real absence of that presence which Dr Pusey and Paschasius claim to be in the consecrated elements. The deceptive statements are, that 'The same doctrine [as 'that held by Dr Pusey] is repeatedly stated by Bertram; and that Paschasius uses the same language.

5. Before entering upon a general examination of the doctrine of Paschasius, we shall briefly notice this last assertion of Dr Pusey, viz., That Paschasius uses the same language as Bertram does respecting the spiritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Bertram states in the citation made by Dr Pusey. (25 33-37.) 'It *is*, indeed, the body of Christ; yet not 'corporal, but spiritual. It *is* the blood of Christ; yet not 'corporal but spiritual. Nothing, therefore, is here to be 'thought of corporally, but spiritually, *It is the body of Christ, but not corporally; and it is the blood of Christ, but 'not corporally.*' The italics are Dr Pusey's. Paschasius in the citation made from him by Dr Pusey, says, (33 27), 'The 'body of Christ is not corrupted, because it is spiritual, and

'the whole which is celebrated in this sacrament is spiritual.' It must be confessed that they use the same language, and Dr Pusey says they do. But we ask, is this all that he could say, and did he know it? and if so, why did he say it at all? He doubtless knew that although they use the same language, they do not use the same language concerning the same things. They plainly and distinctly contradict each other. That which Paschasius in the above words affirms not to be corrupted, because it is spiritual, Bertram affirms to be corrupted because it is corporal; thus, in the very words cited by Dr Pusey, he says, 'But this body, which is celebrated in the church, is, 'according to its visible kind, both corruptible and palpable.' 'For he does not say, "That bread and that wine is Christ." '[The very thing which Paschasius does say.] Had he so 'said, he would have preached a Christ corruptible (which, 'God forbid), and subject to death; for in that food, whatever 'is discerned or tasted corporally, is confessedly subject to corruption.' (25 34, 36.) In a passage not quoted by Dr Pusey, he says, 'But the body which is celebrated in the 'church, is temporal, not eternal, corruptible, not incorruptible.' (25 45.) But the language of Bertram respecting a spiritual body as given above, and on which Dr Pusey places so much emphasis is used of a body not believed by Bertram to be really in the consecrated elements, as it is believed to be both by Paschasius and Dr Pusey, any more than the body of Christ's believing people is in them or the body of Christ was in the manna in the wilderness. Both Dr Pusey and Paschasius use the words spiritual and spiritually in quite a different sense from that of Bertram, as they also do the words sacramentally and mystically. The one sense admitting of a real presence in the consecrated elements, the other being against any such conception.

6. We shall now compare the doctrine of Paschasius on the Real Presence and that of Dr Pusey, his disciple, with that of Bertram and Rabanus Maurus. Paschasius distinctly holds, that there is in the consecrated elements no other thing than the flesh and blood of Christ, and that this is the same flesh which was born of Mary, and suffered on the cross, and rose from the sepulchre; that after this change, there

only remains the figure of bread, or, as Neander expresses it, 'the still subsisting forms of colour, taste, and touch.' (33 1-3.) So really, in his estimation, are the elements by consecration made into the flesh and blood of Christ that he believes they have been frequently visible to the faithful (33 10, 11); that such a change is effected by consecration in the elements, that no part of them form food for the body of those who receive them, nor are they digested in the ordinary way. (33 12.) He understands and interprets such phrases as the following literally; maintaining that they teach that the flesh which was born of Mary, suffered on the cross, and rose from the sepulchre, is received by the mouth of the communicant. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have eternal life in you.' (33 4, 15.) 'He who eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' (33 17, 29.) 'This is my body which shall be delivered for you.' 'This is my blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for you.' (33 15, 16, 28, 29.) Dr Wiseman understands these texts after the same manner. (34 1-12.) So does Dr Pusey. (35 2, 18.)

7. We have now to show how directly contrary the interpretation of these passages, as given by Paschasius, and these his two disciples, is to the interpretation as given by Bertram. He is asked by his prince, 'Whether the body and blood of Christ, which is taken by the mouth of the faithful, be made so under the figure of a mystery, or in reality.' (25 3.) Leaving the word mystery for the present, he denied that they are made so in reality. He remarks, 'Let us define what figure is and what reality.' (25 4.) In illustration of figurative phraseology, he adduces the following instances: 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven.' Or when He 'called Himself a Vine and His disciples the branches;' saying, 'I am the true vine and ye are the branches.' All these passages express one thing and hint at another. (25 5.) To show what reality is, he adduces the following statements, which are frequently made by Paschasius, 'We say that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered, was crucified, &c., nothing is here shadowed

‘under the veil of a figure, but the reality of the matter is exhibited in the natural signification of the words; nor must aught else be understood than is expressed. But in the former instances it is not so. For substantially Christ is not bread, nor is Christ a vine, nor are His apostles branches. So that in this case a *figure* is presented in the expression, but in the former *reality*; that is, the naked and ‘open signification.’ (25 6.) All this is very plain, but Dr Pusey notwithstanding, says, ‘Bertram, in his answer, asserts most distinctly the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ, but *that*, with the very distinction, which I have taught, of a spiritual body, yet not received after the manner ‘of a body.’ (*Real Presence, &c., the doctrine of the Church of England*, p. 205.) In illustration of his statement, he quotes an extract from Bertram (25 10). Some Protestants of the 19th century, not well acquainted with Patristic phraseology, have considered that Bertram did hold a real presence in the consecrated elements. But Dr Pusey, we maintain, ought to know better, and, whether or not, it can be easily demonstrated that he is wrong. In the passage quoted by him we have the phrase ‘since under the veil of corporal bread and ‘corporal wine, there is a spiritual body and spiritual blood.’ But Dr Pusey and Paschasius, as we shall see, give a new meaning to the word spiritual. As used by the early Fathers and by Bertram in the 9th century, it cannot be understood so as to admit of a real presence. In the extract made by Dr Pusey, what is affirmed of the consecrated elements might be, and in substance is, affirmed by Bertram of the manna and the rock. He goes on to say, ‘St Paul affirms that our ‘Fathers did eat the same spiritual meat and drink the same ‘spiritual drink. Perchance you ask what same? The very ‘same, which at this day the company of the faithful eateth ‘and drinketh in the Church. For we may not think them ‘diverse, since one and the same Christ gave His own flesh ‘for food, and His own blood for drink to that people who in ‘the desert were baptized in the cloud and in the sea, and ‘now in the Church feedeth the congregation of the faithful ‘with the bread of His body, and giveth them to drink of the ‘stream of His blood.’ (25 12, 13.) Again, he says, ‘For

‘He who now, in the Church, by His almighty power, ‘spiritually changeth bread and wine into the flesh of His ‘body and the stream of his own blood, at that time, too, ‘wrought invisibly, so that the manna which was given from ‘heaven, and the water which flowed from the rock, became ‘His body and blood.’ (25 15.)

8. Bertram further goes on to shew that those who ‘say ‘that these things are done, not in figure, but in reality ; in ‘speaking thus, they are proved to contradict the writings of ‘the holy Fathers. St. Augustine, a chief doctor of the ‘Church, in his third book of Christian Doctrine, thus writeth : “ ‘Except ye eat ” (saith the Saviour) “ the flesh of the Son “ ‘of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you.” “ ‘He seemeth to commend a flagitious crime. His words, “ ‘therefore, are in a figure, bidding us to communicate in the “ ‘Lord’s passion, and faithfully store up in our memory that “ ‘His flesh was crucified and wounded for us.” We see this ‘doctor saith that the mystery of the body and blood of ‘Christ is celebrated by the faithful under a figure.’ (25 17-19.)

9. Rabanus Maurus, the leading commentator and divine of his age, in his instruction to the clergy, quotes the same passage from Augustine as a key to find whether a passage in Holy Scripture is literal or figurative. (26 30.) Frudegard, a monk, quoted the same passage against Paschasius, and how he answered it, or rather failed to do so, may be seen in our extracts from his writings. (33 18.) This attempt at an explanation probably has never been repeated, and is beneath notice. This clear, popular, and accurate statement of Augustine, from one of his most carefully written productions, forms no part of Dr Pusey’s 400 pages of *Catena Patrum*, although he has quoted a passage from the same little treatise : yet he informs us that ‘he has suppressed nothing, that he has not ‘knowingly omitted anything ;’ and as a proof of his conscientiousness, he appeals to Dean Goode as a witness. (35 41, 53.) Is it credible that an author so much reputed for patristic learning should have so limited a knowledge of the best-known passages in the writings of the great Augustine ?

10. Dr Pusey makes another citation from Bertram (25

26), but from which he gets no real proof of his doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements. Here Bertram speaks of the body and blood of Christ as figures, but not, of course, as bare or unmeaning figures, but figures through which Christ can be spiritually communicated to the soul, and are, in virtue and power, but not really and truly Christ's body and blood. This is the common view of our Reformers, Zwingli not excepted. (29 10, 12, 13, 23.) But the spiritual presence here defined by Bertram is repudiated by Paschasius, who says, 'I marvel 'why some wish now to say . . . that in the sacrament there 'is a certain virtue of the flesh, and not the flesh ; that there 'is the virtue of the blood, and not the blood.' (33 29.)

11. We now come to Bertram's answer to the second question, which he introduces as follows: 'Now we must 'examine the second question proposed, and see whether the 'self-same body, which was born of Mary, which suffered, 'died, and was buried, and which sitteth at the right hand of 'the Father, be that which daily in the Church is received 'by the mouths of the faithful in the mystery of the sacra- 'ment.' (25 27.) In answer, he first appeals to the judgment of Ambrose ; but as Paschasius had appealed to the same passage in support of his view of the case, this shall be first given, and then will naturally follow Bertram's answer. Paschasius says 'the opinion of Ambrose is most complete and 'true in that book in which he says, "For in the sacrament ' "there is the flesh itself of Christ, which was on the cross ' "and taken of the Virgin Mary, and the blood which flowed ' "from His side." ' (33 22.) How Bertram cites Ambrose, and interprets him, may be seen in 25 28, 29. There Bertram shows that the consecrated elements, as received by the body, are corruptible ; the very thing which Paschasius denies. (33 12.)

12. But we are more concerned at present with the passage quoted by Paschasius from Ambrose, which is given more correctly by Bertram, and here follows: 'The same 'author addeth, "It was surely the true flesh of Christ which ' "was crucified, which was buried ; therefore this is truly the ' "sacrament of His flesh. The Lord Jesus Himself pro-

“claims, This is my body.” (25 30.) Bertram then remarks :—

‘How carefully, how warily, is this distinction drawn! Of the ‘flesh of Christ, which was crucified, which was buried—that is, in ‘respect of which Christ was crucified and buried—he saith, “This ‘“was surely the true flesh of Christ;” but of that which is received in the sacrament [sacramentally], he declareth, “Therefore ‘“this is truly the sacrament of that flesh.” Here he distinguisheth ‘between the flesh itself; inasmuch as he saith that He was crucified ‘and buried in that true flesh which He took of the Virgin; but that ‘the mystery, which is now performed in the Church, is the sacrament of that true flesh, in the which He was crucified. Here he ‘openly teacheth the faithful, that the flesh in which Christ was crucified and buried is no mystery, but real and natural; while the flesh ‘now in a mystery, containeth the similitude of the former, is not ‘flesh in its nature, but in a sacrament [sacramentally]. For in its ‘nature it is bread, but in the sacrament it is the true body of Christ, ‘as the Lord Jesus Himself says, “This is my body.”’ (25 31, 32.)

It should be observed that Bertram does not here say that Christ’s true body is in the consecrated elements; he ably and consistently refutes that notion. The reader should note well the essential difference there is between the meaning of the phrases, the body of Christ and the sacrament or mystery of the body of Christ. Paschasius and Dr Pusey ignore this distinction.

13. Bertram still continues to quote from the same treatise of Ambrose in answer to Paschasius and in defence of the truth.’ (25 33-37.) Dr Pusey, as we have seen, has thought proper to cite this long passage, and claim it as teaching the doctrine of the Real Presence as held by himself. He prefaces the quotation thus :—‘Yet, Bertram, who repeatedly ‘insists on the Real Presence, and that what we receive in the ‘Holy Eucharist is the body of Christ, insists also that the ‘body is a “spiritual body,” and is present, “not corporally,” ‘or after the manner of a body.’ Bertram, however, cites Ambrose, and comments upon it to prove against Paschasius that the consecrated elements are not the body and blood of Christ; but Dr Pusey quotes the whole to prove that Christ’s body and blood are present in the consecrated elements after the manner of a spirit. Bertram certainly holds no such view as Dr Pusey would fain ascribe to him. If the reader will turn to the passage cited from Ambrose as it stands in our

extracts from him (17 15), he will see that Ambrose determines what he means by the word spiritual, by quoting and applying the passage of Scripture, 'Our fathers did eat spiritual meat, and did drink spiritual drink.' How Bertram applied the word spiritual, occurring in this text in relation to the elements in the Lord's Supper has been noticed above (sec. 7), and in the quotation before us, he remarks on Ambrose, 'Most clearly has he taught, how we ought to understand the mystery of the body and blood of Christ. For when he said that our fathers did eat spiritual food, and drink spiritual drink; while yet no one doubts that that manna which they eat, and that water which they drank, were corporal; he goes on to define in what sense that mystery, which is performed in the Church, is the body of Christ.' (25 36.)

14. Bertram continues (we here quote what Dr Pusey has omitted).

'By the authority of this most learned Ambrose, we are taught that the difference is wide between the body in which Christ suffered, and the blood, which, when hanging on the cross He shed from His side, and that the body, which in the mystery of Christ's passion, is daily celebrated by the faithful, and that blood, which is taken by the mouths of the faithful, that to them it may be the mystery of that blood by which the whole world was redeemed. . . . Real blood flowed from a real body; but now the blood of Christ, which the faithful drink, and His body which they eat, are one thing in nature, and another in signification.' (25 38, 39.)

15. Our protestant and evangelical friends need not be alarmed at Bertram using the sacramental language of Scripture, of all antiquity, and of our scriptural Prayer Book, and calling the consecrated bread and wine by that which they signify or represent, or that of which they are a memorial, viz., Christ's body and blood. By using such sacramental language, Bertram no more teaches that the devout communicant eats Christ's body in the consecrated bread, than he eats himself and all true believers. Bertram is very explicit on this point. He says:—

'It is further to be considered, that in that bread—not the body of Christ is figured, but also that [body] of the people who believe in Him. . . . As that bread is taken to be the body of Christ in a

'mystery, so likewise are the members of the people that believe in Christ signified in a mystery. And as that bread is called the body of believers, not corporally, but spiritually; so also must we understand the body of Christ not corporally, but spiritually.' (25 42, 43.) Again, he says respecting the consecrated wine, 'If therefore, that wine, when consecrated by the office of the minister, is corporally changed into the blood of Christ, the water also, which is mixed with it, must necessarily be corporally changed into the blood of the faithful people. For where the consecration is one, there followeth also the same operation; and where the cause is the same, the mystery which followeth is the same also. But we see no change made in the water, as to bodily substance; and, therefore, there is no corporal change in the wine. Whatever in the water signifieth the people of Christ; is taken spiritually; whatever therefore in the wine representeth the blood of Christ, must be taken spiritually too.' (25 44.) Further, when commenting on his quotation from Augustine, he remarks, 'St Augustine sufficiently teacheth us, that, in the bread which is placed on the altar, the body of Christ is signified, as well as the body of the people who receive. . . . But that which is placed on the Lord's table, containeth the mystery of that body, as also again it containeth the mystery of the body of believing people, as the apostle testifieth, "We being many, are one bread and one body in Christ."' (25 61.) Finally, in summing up his argument he states, 'But in the body which is celebrated in a mystery, there is a figure not only of the proper body of Christ, but also of the people that believe in Christ. For it beareth the figure of either body, that is, of the body of Christ, which suffered and rose again, and of the people, who in Christ are born again and quickened from the dead.' (25 63.)

Such statements need no comment, and their application to the point for which they have been adduced, is self-evident.

16. As a matter of certainty, Ambrose and Bertram—the interpreter and the one interpreted, define in what sense that mystery which is performed in the Church is the body of Christ, by showing that it was exactly the same in sense as it was in that mystery or sacrament in the Church in the wilderness, namely, the sacrament or mystery of Christ's body and blood in the manna and the water from the rock. It would be interesting to know how Dr Pusey understands the word 'spiritual' in 1 Cor. x. 1-4, on which as we have seen, Ambrose and Bertram lay such stress. We need not conjecture, for happily he has told us: for he says, 'St Paul does not say, "That Rock was Christ," until he had before said, "that spiritual rock;" showing that he spake in a figure.' (35 15.)

Very good, very true. But both Paschasius and Dr Pusey deny that the words, 'This is my body.' 'This is my blood,' were spoken in a figure; or that in celebrating the Lord's Supper, what is there done, is done in a figure. But this is exactly what Bertram maintains, and what he cites Ambrose to prove, as he also does Augustine, as we shall have occasion shortly to notice. He employs a great number of different words and phrases in relation to the Lord's Supper, all of which are fatal to such a real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements as maintained by Paschasius and Dr Pusey. The following are specimens given in the shortest extracts,—

'The mystery of the body and blood of Christ . . . is performed 'under no *figure* or *veil*.' (25 2.) 'Was made *in a mystery*.' (3.) 'Was performed *under a figure*.' (7.) 'Bread and wine are *figuratively* the body and blood of Christ.' (8.) 'Will take nothing *figuratively*.' (9.) 'Must acknowledge it to be wrought *in a figure*, or *figuratively*.' (10.) '*In the mystery* of Christ's body.' (16.) 'Are *done in a figure*, not in reality.' (17.) 'His words therefore are *in a figure*.' (18.) 'Celebrated by the faithful *under a figure*.' (19.) 'Flesh which is now *in a mystery*,' '*in a sacrament*;' 'but *sacramentally* it is the true body of Christ.' (32.) 'For he says, "*In that sacrament* Christ is." For he does not say, "That bread and that wine "are Christ." (34.) 'Not the body of Christ alone *is figured*, the *people are figured* who believe in Him.' (42.) 'The body of Christ *in a mystery*; the people that believe in Christ are *signified in a mystery*.' (43.) '"This is the bread which came down from heaven." 'This bread, the manna, *signified*: this bread the altar of God *doth signify*.' (47. 21 77.) 'The body of Christ *mystically* celebrated *in the Church*. The manner of *figure* and of *image*.' (25 49.) 'That *which we touch under the image of the sacrament*.' (50.) 'Pledge and image are the *pledge* and *image* of some other thing. This body and blood are the *pledge* and *image* of some future thing.' (51.) 'That which the Church celebrated, is both the body and blood of Christ, but yet as a *pledge*, as an *image*. The reality we shall then possess when *pledge* and *image* shall be no more, but the thing itself in reality shall appear.' (52.) '"What we now celebrate *in figure*, "we may receive in very truth." He saith that the things are celebrated *in a figure*, not in truth, that is, *in the likeness*, not by the exhibition of the thing itself. . . . This body is *the pledge* and *figure*, but that is the truth itself.' (53.) 'When he saith, that in these sacrifices there was a signification of what should be given us, but in this sacrifice a commemoration of what has been given us, he clearly *implieth*, that, as the one had a *figure* of things to come, so this sacrifice too is a *figure* of things past.' (56.) 'For the one is the proper

‘and true body, and hath naught in it *of mystery or figure*; the other *is mystical*, and sheweth one thing by a *figure* outwardly.’ (57.) ‘The Lord’s proper body is not veiled *under any figure*; the body set on the Lord’s table is a *figure*, because it is a *sacrament*. (59.) The bread which is called the body of Christ, and the cup which is the blood of Christ, *is a figure*, because it is a *mystery*. (62.) But in this other which is celebrated *in a mystery*, there *is a figure* not only of the proper body of Christ, but also of the people that believe in Christ. For it beareth *the figure of* either.’ (63.) ‘We are taught both of our Saviour, and by St Paul the apostle, that this bread and cup, which are placed on the altar, are placed *in a figure* or *in memory* of the Lord’s death.’ (65.)

17. Beyond all question Bertram understood and interpreted the words of institution in the Lord’s Supper *in a figure* or *figuratively*, and the action therein as done *in a figure* or *figuratively*, in fact, being precisely and exactly analogous to the sacraments or mysteries of the church in the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 1-4) which were most certainly done in a figure, as Dr Pusey, as we have seen, rightly states. But do Paschasius and Dr Pusey so interpret the sacraments or mysteries of the Christian Church? Most certainly not. The former makes a marked distinction between the things signified in the manna and the rock, or the spiritual food of the sacraments of the church in the wilderness, as compared with those of the Christian Church, not only contrary to Ambrose and Bertram, but all early antiquity, as we shall show before we have finished. (33 8, 9.) The latter contrasts the one with the other, and adduces the sacraments in the wilderness to show that they were done in a figure, for no other reason than to show that the sacrament of the Christian Church is not done in a figure (35 15, 16); because in the one case St Paul used the word ‘spiritual,’ showing that he spake in a figure, but in the other no such qualifying term being used, the phrase, ‘This is my body,’ was not spoken in a figure, for ‘the word ‘body,’ he says, ‘is no figure. For the Lord says, “This is “*my* Body?”’

18. Now, in the name of common honesty, why does Dr Pusey assert that Bertram teaches his doctrine of the Real Presence, and then quote him, as if he did, when there is such positive proof that he did not hold, but very conclusively refuted it; for after having given most cogent and conclusive

arguments, he thus sums up the whole, 'Your wisdom, most 'illustrious prince, may understand that it hath been most 'clearly shown, by the testimony of holy Scripture, and the 'words of the holy Fathers, that the bread, which is called 'the body of Christ, and the cup, which is called the blood of 'Christ, is a figure, because it is a mystery. (25 62.)

19. It is surpassingly strange that Dr Pusey should quote the arguments which Bertram used to refute the doctrine of Paschasius to uphold and support it, viz., the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ, not spiritually present, but present after the manner of a spirit in the consecrated elements, which is the very doctrine Dr Pusey holds (35 11, 16, 20, 21, 67.) He would seem to bring, as far as words are concerned, Paschasius into an agreement in doctrine with Bertram; for after his long extract from Bertram, which has occupied our attention for some time, he immediately adds: 'Paschasius Radbertus (with whom Bertram has been so often 'popularly contrasted, and against whom he has ever been 'supposed to have written), uses the same language.' But this point has already been considered (Sec. 5 above.)

20. It is then neither more nor less than deceptive to the unlearned reader, for Dr Pusey to bring in his doctrine on the shoulders of Bertram, since he is not for, but most distinctly against, him. The main points of the controversy now lying before us will turn upon the private or unauthorized interpretation and use of such words and phrases as the following, 'spiritually,' 'mystically,' 'sacramentally,' 'in a sacrament,' 'in a figure,' 'in a type,' 'the body and blood of 'Christ,' etc., etc. Dean Goode gave a very needful caution to any who may read Dr Pusey's writings on the Eucharist, which is as follows:—

'One caution I would premise at the outset, and one which I am convinced any thoughtful reader of Dr Pusey's works on this subject will 'at once see the justice of, namely, that a very large portion of those 'works consists of statements which, while forming part of his argument, *beg the whole question*; their applicability and force depending 'wholly upon the meaning of certain *terms* used in them, *the proper interpretation of which forms one of the great points at issue*. For 'instance, the words "the holy Eucharist," "the sacrament," "the "Lord's body," are all used by Dr Pusey as necessarily bearing the

'sense he attached to them, and passages in which they occur in other authors are quoted as testimonies in his favour, when, in fact, the proper meaning to be attached to these phrases, is the chief point in dispute. After consecration the bread may be very properly called "the Lord's Body," as being so representatively and symbolically, by those who are wholly opposed to the notion of the real Body of our Lord being present in or under it. Dr Pusey may intend to be very honest in the matter, but the effect of his following such a course is, that whatever success he obtains with his readers in such a way, is obtained, not by valid arguments, but by deluding and mystifying them.'—*Supplement to Dean Goode's Work on the Eucharist*, p. 17.

21. Dr Pusey, with Paschasius, uses the terms, 'spiritual,' 'spiritually,' 'sacrament,' 'sacramentally,' 'mystery,' 'mystically,' in a sense compatible with, if not inclusive of, the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements; whereas Bertram, and, as we shall see, all antiquity, use the words as incompatible with any such notion.

22. In the passage quoted from Paschasius by Dr Pusey it is stated, 'I have, as I hear, aroused many to the right understanding of this mystery, because it was said that the flesh profiteth nothing; so that they learnt and understood to think worthily of Christ, whose body is not corrupted, because it is spiritual, and the whole which is celebrated in this sacrament is spiritual, because it is the Spirit which quickeneth.' (33 27.) The phrase 'the body of Christ is not corrupted' is a singular one to use in connection with the Lord's Supper, and it is unaccountable that Dr Pusey should quote the sentence containing it apparently with approval and as an argument to support his view of the Real Presence, namely, that there is the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ, yet 'not after the manner of a body.'

23. Now no Christian could affirm that Christ's real body was corrupted in the sacrament, but all antiquity down to the ninth century held that the bread and wine, which after consecration are, according to Scripture, called body and blood, materially nourished the body of the partaker, and, in fact, were corrupted. This is the very thing which Paschasius denies (33 12), but which Bertram and Rabanus Maurus as strenuously affirm. The phrase, 'is not corrupted,' is one which is commonly quoted as a Latin version of John vi. 27, 'Labour for the meat which is not corrupted' (*Operumini*

escam quæ non corrumpitur). It is so quoted by Augustine and Rabanus Maurus. (21 27; 26 7.) Our Lord of course enjoined upon His hearers to labour for immaterial and spiritual food which could be obtained by faith either out of, or in, the sacrament. But Paschasius maintains that the bread and wine, when consecrated, are converted into, or become 'the body of Christ which was born of Mary, and suffered on the cross, and rose from the sepulchre' (33 2); and that no part of them are digested in the ordinary way by the receivers, but all is changed into what is spiritual. In answer to this, Bertram expressly states, 'But the body which is celebrated in the Church, is temporal, not eternal; corruptible, not incorruptible.' . . . 'No one can deny that the thing is corrupted which is broken in parts and distributed to be taken; which is ground by the teeth, and passed into the body.' (25 45, 46.) He quotes a passage from that most learned Father Jerome in which it is maintained that 'the blood of Christ, and the flesh of Christ, are taken in two senses. They are either that spiritual and divine flesh and blood, of which He Himself saith, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed," or the flesh which was crucified and the blood which was poured out by the soldier's spear.' (25 40). Then Bertram remarks, 'The difference is not small which this doctor distinguisheth concerning the body and blood of Christ,' and then shows that the body which was crucified is not said to be spiritual, but that the one taken by the mouths of the faithful is spiritual. (25 41.) And spiritual in the same sense in the mystery or sacrament as the body of believers is spiritual, 'and as that bread is called the body of believers not corporally, but spiritually; so also must we understand the body of Christ not corporally, but spiritually.' (25 43.) Again, 'Whatever in the water signifieth the people of Christ, is taken spiritually; whatever, therefore, in the wine representeth the blood of Christ, must be taken spiritually too.' (25 44.) Bertram also teaches, as we have noticed above (secs. 7, 13), that the body of Christ is spiritual food to the faithful in the same sense as He was spiritual food to the faithful Israelites in the wilderness.

24. It is worthy of notice that Bertram makes no account of Paschasius asserting that Christ's body in the sacrament is a spiritual body ; but answers him as if he openly maintained that it was a corporal or carnal one, as the body which was crucified and the blood which was shed, as Bertram shows, could be present in no other way. In the same manner our learned divines, in the sixteenth century, utterly disregarded the spiritual presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, as the Roman Catholics pretended, but considered them to teach a corporal presence, as the nature of the Romish argument required. Dr Pusey has taken great advantage of this circumstance, and quotes considerable portions of the Prayer Book, where the words 'spiritual' and 'heavenly' are employed in connection with the Lord's Supper to show that they did not protest against the doctrine of the Real Presence, as held by him, but against a carnal and corporal one, which, it would appear, no one openly avowed, so that it would seem our learned divines were protesting against a fiction of their own imagination. Mr Cobb, a zealous and devoted disciple of Dr Pusey, argues out his teacher's views, and comes to the conclusion that, although the early divines of our Reformed Church did protest against the doctrine of transubstantiation ; yet what they really meant was transaccidentation, which no one held.

25. It might just as well be maintained that, as Bertram argues against a natural and corporal presence in the Sacrament as in effect held by Paschasius, he admitted what he called a spiritual presence, whereas he does no such thing. Yet most who read Dr Pusey's extracts from Bertram and Paschasius, placed as they are in juxtaposition, and accompanied with his bold, but most unfounded assertion, could not but believe that there was no important disagreement between them. But Bertram, still further to refute Paschasius and defend the ancient and orthodox doctrine, cites six passages from Augustine. (25 47.)

26. As Paschasius uses the words spiritual and spiritually, and also Dr Pusey, his disciple in this respect, in a sense contrary to all early antiquity, so both teacher and pupil use the words and phrases 'mystery,' 'in a mystery,' 'mystically,'

and their exact equivalents, 'sacrament,' 'in a sacrament,' 'sacramentally,' after the same manner. With them the phrases, the mystery or sacrament of Christ's body and blood, Christ's body and blood in a mystery or sacrament, mystically or sacramentally mean, without any figure of speech, His real body and blood, and that whoever take the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, or Christ's body and blood in a sacrament or sacramentally, really take Christ's body and blood. This absurd notion was not hatched until the ninth century, and Paschasius has the discredit of being the author and inventor of it. At present we have only to show how Bertram treated this novel and heterodox notion. For the sentiments of Paschasius on the subject, the reader has only to consult the following reference to our extracts from his writings. (33 27.) How closely Dr Pusey has followed the inventor of this kind of thing may be seen by consulting the following references. (35 11, 20, 21, 61, 67.)

27. In examining the testimony of Bertram on this point, we shall notice the passages containing it in the order in which they occur in the extracts from his treatise in answer to Paschasius. At the outset he states the views of Paschasius, which are, that the mystery of the body and blood of Christ is performed under no figure, but with the naked exhibition of the reality; and the view which he considers to be the orthodox one is, that the body and blood of Christ are contained under the figure of a mystery. (25 2.) Then he further informs us that the doctrine of Paschasius is, that the body and blood of Christ are taken by the mouth of the faithful in reality, but according to his own doctrine they are taken in a mystery. In the former case, the eye without the veil of a mystery gazes on the body outwardly, which the eye of the soul inwardly beholdeth; in the latter a hidden thing is contained which lies open to the eye of faith alone. (25 3.)

28. We cannot forbear noticing in passing Dr Pusey's misrepresentation of this part of Bertram's statement, He says, 'Bertram had two questions put to him by Charles the Bald—' (1) whether "the mystery of the body and blood of Christ, "celebrated daily in the Church, took place, under no

“figure or veil, but with a naked manifestation of the ‘mystery ;’ in other words, whether what we *see*, is the body of Christ’ (*The Real Presence*, &c., p. 205). For that statement we are referred to Bertram’s treatise, but on referring to it we find the following: ‘The mystery of the body and blood of Christ, which is daily celebrated in the Church, is performed under no figure or veil, but with the naked exhibition of the *reality itself*.’ (25 2.) In consequence of Dr Pusey’s substituting the words, ‘naked manifestation of the ‘mystery ;’ for the words, ‘naked manifestation of the ‘reality itself,’ he brings Bertram into harmony with himself. No one could read this pretended citation from Bertram without coming to the conclusion that he understood the word mystery and used it in the sense Paschasius and Dr Pusey do. In the sentence, as thus quoted, the word mystery, as used in the last part, determines its meaning as used in the first, but by this means the reader is not rightly instructed, but deceived. The phrase, ‘naked manifestation of the mystery,’ would be sheer nonsense to Bertram, it would be like talking of the naked manifestation of a sign or symbol. With Bertram the naked manifestation of the reality itself was not the manifestation of the mystery, but the manifestation of that which the mystery signified or represented.

29. Again, Dr Pusey said, by way of interpreting the phrase he misquoted from Bertram, ‘in other words, whether ‘what we *see*, is the body of Christ.’ But this is only a part of the truth which very often is a most dangerous form of falsehood. The whole truth is, ‘Whether without the veil of ‘any mystery, the sight gazeth on that body outwardly, ‘which the eye of the soul inwardly beholdeth.’ (25 3.) As we have seen, Paschasius held that such a change was effected in the elements after consecration, that they cease to be what they were in their own nature, and become spiritual, and that no part of them is corrupted by the receivers. Paschasius did not hold that the real body of Christ was ordinarily seen, though he affirmed that it had ‘often appeared ‘in a bodily form ;’ ‘had been shown in a visible form in the ‘shape of a lamb, or in the colour of flesh and blood ;’ ‘a ‘lamb might be seen in the hands and blood in the cup ;’

and that on one occasion the bread was changed into Christ in the shape of an infant whom the priest took into his arms and kissed, and afterwards eat under the appearance of bread. (33 10, 11.) Bertram then, in the above account, did his best to express the unaccountable sentiments of Paschasius. Bertram did not say that the body of the Lord was actually seen, but only outwardly, by the bodily eye, and inwardly by the gaze of the soul. This view of Paschasius, as thus described by Bertram, is very much like that of Dr Pusey; and, in fact, is exactly like that of Mr Bennett, his zealous, loving, and devoted disciple. He has openly taught, printed, and published, that the presence of Christ upon the altars of our churches is a real, actual, and *visible* presence. (37 1.) It is true he altered the expression of his views at the earnest request of Dr Pusey, his teacher and guide, but after having done so, he declared 'my meaning, and that which passed through my mind in writing the original passages, was precisely the same as that which is now conveyed in the words substituted.' (37 2.)

30. We must now return to our examination of the term mystery and its synonymes, as employed by Bertram. He defines what figure is, and what reality is (25 4), plainly showing that in his mind the phrase in a mystery was utterly incompatible with the notion of a Real Presence, such as that held by Paschasius, and now held by Dr Pusey. Then he further argues that if the mystery be performed under no figure, it is not rightly called a mystery, since that cannot be called a mystery in which there is nothing hid. Then he shows that the consecrated bread is one thing outwardly to the sense, but signifies another thing inwardly to the souls of the faithful, and remarks that the consecrated bread and wine are in a figure and not in reality the body and blood of Christ. (25 7.) He further states that as the consecrated elements are corporally handled, they are in their nature corporal creatures, which Paschasius denied; but as spiritually made, they are the mysteries of the body and blood of Christ. (25 10.) Again, he says, 'the Holy Ghost, speaking in the Psalmist, teaches us both what our fathers received in that heavenly manna, and what the faithful ought to believe in

‘the mystery of Christ’s body. In either surely Christ is ‘signified, who feedeth the souls of believers.’ (25 16.)

31. In the opinion of Bertram, the body and blood of Christ were no more really present in the mystery or sacrament of the Lord’s Supper than in the manna, but were alike signified in both, and were the food of believers. Then he favours us with the well-known sentiments of Augustine, namely, that the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is not really the body of Christ, but only so after a certain manner, and the same of the blood of Christ. (25 20, 21.) Frudegard had posed Paschasius with this statement of Augustine. The contemptible reply of Paschasius should be noticed. He states ‘the body and blood of Christ are so as ‘the sacrament of faith is faith.’ (33 25.) Again he says, ‘For as the doctor himself says, “the sacrament of faith is “faith,” so the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament ‘are real flesh and blood.’ (33 26.) But it is certain that in the mind of Augustine the sacrament of faith was not really faith, but only sacramentally or significantly so. Thus immediately after the words cited, and so stupidly applied by Paschasius, Augustine goes on to say—‘When the answer is ‘given that a little child believes, who has not yet the feeling ‘of faith, he is said to have faith [not that the child really has ‘it] on account of the sacrament of faith [that which signifies ‘or represents it]. . . . Yet, nevertheless, the sacrament of ‘that very faith makes the little child one of the faithful. ‘For as it is said to believe, so also it is called faithful, not by ‘assenting to the thing with the very mind, but by receiving ‘the sacrament of that very thing.’ (21 3.) From this reference to Augustine, it will be seen that Dr Pusey, like Paschasius, has quoted a part, but like him has also omitted the most important and explanatory part of Augustine’s sentiments. On these views of Augustine, Bertram well remarks, —‘We see, St Augustine saith, that the sacraments are one ‘thing, and the things of which they are sacraments another, &c.’ (25 20-22.) ‘Whence mysteries are styled the Lord’s body ‘and the Lord’s blood, for they take the name of those things, ‘of which they are the sacraments.’ (25 23.) Nothing can be more fatal to Dr Pusey’s assumptions, viz., that his doctrine

of the Real Presence is that of Augustineⁿ or of Bertram. Isidore's account of Christian sacraments with Bertram's remarks thereon we must pass over for the present. (25 23-25.)

32. Then from the very passage Paschasius had adduced to favour his own views, Bertram proceeds to show, on the authority of Ambrose, the essential difference there is between the sacrament of a thing and the thing itself, which distinction both Paschasius and Dr Pusey ignore. Bertram, however, shows how carefully, how warily Ambrose made it; that 'he ' openly teacheth the faithful that the flesh in which Christ ' was crucified and buried is no mystery, but real and natural, ' while the flesh, which now in a mystery containeth the ' similitude of the former, is not flesh in its nature, but in a ' sacrament.' (25 31, 32.)

33. Bertram shows, in common with the early Church, that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper the body of Christ's believing people is as much signified, and is present, as the body of Christ is; and remarks—'For which reason, as ' that bread is taken to be the body of Christ in a mystery, so ' likewise are the members of the people that believe in Christ ' signified in a mystery.' (25 42, 43.) Again, in support of the same thing, he says—'For where the consecration is one, ' there followeth also one operation; and where the cause is ' the same, the mystery which followeth is the same also.' (25 44.)

34. Now, no one pretends that such sacramental language as the sacrament or mystery of Christ's faithful people, or ' Christ's faithful people in a sacrament or mystery,' means their real presence in the sacrament or mystery, no more does the like language mean the Real Presence of Christ's body in the sacrament or mystery, and so Bertram very distinctly teaches. He affirms that certain things said of the real body of Christ 'cannot be said of the body of Christ, which in the ' Church is mystically celebrated; we know that it is the body ' of Christ after a certain manner, the manner namely of figure ' and of image.' (25 49.)

35. He continues: 'We see, then, that the mystery ' of the body and blood of Christ, which is now received in the ' Church by the faithful, is separated by a wide difference from

‘that which was born of Mary, which suffered,’ &c. (25 54). After quoting a most important passage from Fulgentius (25 55, 56), which should be read, he observes, ‘By these words he most evidently showeth how great is the difference between the body in which Christ suffered, and this body which is for the communication of His Passion and death. For the one is the proper and true body, and hath naught in it of mystery or figure; the other is mystical and showeth one thing by a figure outwardly, while it representeth another thing inwardly through the understanding of faith.’ (25 57.)

36. We come now to the most important part of all, viz., an extract from Augustine, and with which Bertram concludes his treatise. The first part of the citation will be found 21 135, on which he remarks, ‘This venerable author, in these words instructeth us what we ought to think of our Lord’s proper body, which was born of Mary, &c., and what of that, which is placed on the altar, and received by the people. The former is entire, is neither cut nor divided, nor veiled under any figure; the latter, which is set on the Lord’s table, is a figure, because it is a sacrament,’ &c. (25 58, 59.) He then says, ‘When Augustine would speak somewhat more openly and clearly of the mystical body, he addeth, “Wherefore if ye wish to understand,”’ &c. (25 60, and for the full passage see 21 136.) The reader should note well how very differently Bertram cites Augustine from Dr Pusey—the latter had to defend the heresy of Paschasius, the former had to refute it. On referring to the citation from Augustine (21 135, 136), it will be seen that from the very short discourse of Augustine how, while quoting the first part (sec. 135), he has omitted the second (sec. 136), which Bertram has quoted with so much effect. On the citation in question, Bertram remarks, ‘St Augustine sufficiently teacheth us, that in the bread which is placed on the altar, the body of Christ is signified, as well as the body of the people who receive, to the intent he might plainly show Christ’s proper body to be that in which He was born of the Virgin, &c. But that which is placed on the Lord’s table, containeth the mystery of that body, as also again it containeth the mystery of the body of believing people, as the Apostle testifieth,

“We being many are one bread, and one body in Christ.”’
(25 61.)

37. Dr Pusey has told us, ‘The same doctrine [of the Real Presence as he holds] is repeatedly stated by Bertram.’ ‘Bertram asserts most distinctly the Real Presence of the body ‘and blood of Christ.’ ‘Bertram, who repeatedly insists on ‘the Real Presence.’ These deliberate assertions, three deep, without, and against the plainest and most abundant, evidence, as the reader cannot fail to have seen, are all recorded on a small leaf (pp. 205, 206). Doubtless these repeated declarations, much strengthened by concentration, were intended to enforce a belief of them. How many of Dr Pusey’s disciples and others have read and believed them we know not, but whoever has been so unfortunate to be of the number has been much deceived.

38. We shall confront Paschasius and Dr Pusey with Bertram only on one other point. The ancient Fathers commonly spoke of the consecrated elements as types, symbols, signs, figures, images, &c. This fact has been found a serious difficulty to Paschasius and his followers in their maintenance of the doctrine of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements as types, symbols, signs, figures, images, &c. Roman Catholics have found it most convenient to ignore or explain away the use of such language. Paschasius, the father of the heresy, endeavours to surmount the difficulty as follows: Admitting the figures and images in the consecrated elements, he must find the realities there also, and he expressly states that ‘the ‘sacrament is rightly called the reality and the figure at the ‘same time.’ (33 6.) He fixes on the words of the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as they stand in the Latin version of his time; he quotes the words, ‘Who being the ‘brightness of his glory and the figure of his substance.’ (Heb. i. 3.) Here, as he shows, he finds figure and reality. (33 6.) Frudegard had called his attention to Augustine’s exposition of the words of our Lord, ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye shall not have life in you.’ (See. 25 18, 19.) In reply to this, Paschasius refers to other statements of Augustine, and says:—

‘Moreover, how this very same doctor, so eminent, said, contrary to

‘himself, as I remember, in his sermons to neophytes, “Receive ye
 ‘“this,” said he, “in the bread which hung upon the cross,” and of
 ‘the cup, “Receive ye this,” said he, “in the cup which flowed from
 ‘“His side.” I do not believe that any other thing hung on the cross
 ‘than the flesh, nor anything flowed from Christ’s side than blood and
 ‘water. And if this is so, believers receive this, that is the flesh and
 ‘blood, with which water is mixed, in which sacraments are the regen-
 ‘erated, and therefore these two are mixed in the cup, &c. . . .
 ‘These things are certainly mystical in which there is the reality of the
 ‘flesh and of the blood, not of another than Christ, yet in mystery and
 ‘in figure. It is not wonderful, therefore, if the figure be this mys-
 ‘tery, and the words of this mystery be called a figurative speech
 ‘[alluding to the exposition of Augustine] when Christ Himself is
 ‘called by the Apostle Paul an express image or figure, although He
 ‘is Himself the reality. For he says, “In these last days he hath
 ‘“spoken to us,” namely, God the Father, “in His Son who since He
 ‘“is the brightness of His glory and the figure, or express image (as
 ‘“other copies have it) of His substance.” So as thou hearest the
 ‘supreme Reality Christ Himself is called “express image” and
 ‘“figure,” yet in Him there was nothing fictitious, nothing void of
 ‘reality. . . . Respecting which right signification in the same my
 ‘little book, which thou dost testify that thou didst read, I have pub-
 ‘lished in one of the chapters that this mystery and reality are com-
 ‘prehended, nor yet is it denied that there is a figure.’ (33 19, 20.)

39. As the history and contents of the letter of Paschasius to Frudegard are of importance as illustrative of the origin of the controversy, the account of Dupin is here added :—

‘A long time after this treatise was published (for it was written
 ‘in 831, before Paschasius was Abbot of Corbey, and what we are
 ‘going to say happened but about the latter end of his life, towards
 ‘the year 864.) Frudegard, a monk of the new Abbey of Corbey,
 ‘for whose monks Paschasius had composed this book, having met
 ‘with some men of a different opinion, and himself entertaining some
 ‘doubts upon this subject, did freely write unto him his thoughts
 ‘upon the matter. In answer to which Paschasius writ him a letter,
 ‘wherein he explained and confirmed what he had laid down in his
 ‘treatise concerning the body and blood of our Saviour. There he
 ‘says that, notwithstanding the scruples of those persons, he had good
 ‘reason to maintain that it is the very flesh of our Saviour which is
 ‘given to us in the Eucharist, the same flesh that was born of the
 ‘Virgin, and the same blood that was shed upon the cross. Otherwise,
 ‘says he, how can this sacrament confer eternal life and remission of
 ‘sins, were it not the flesh and blood of Him who is life and salvation?
 ‘Frudegard did own it to him that he had been of that opinion, but
 ‘that having read in the third book of the Christian Doctrine, writ
 ‘by St Augustine, that these words of our Saviour, “This is my body,
 ‘“this is my flesh,” are a figurative expression, and a figure more than

‘a reality, he could not tell how to reconcile that with his former sentiment ; and the rather, considering what that holy Father seems to say, that it were a horrible thing to believe that Christians eat the same body which was born of the Virgin, and drink the same blood that was shed upon the cross. To which Paschasius answers, that it is not inconsistent with good sense to say that those words of our Saviour are a figurative expression, because there is a figure in this mystery ; and that the real body and blood of Christ are really found in it, but in a mystery and figure, as our Saviour is called the character and figure of His Father, though He is really God. That he has sufficiently explained it in his book, by asserting that the Eucharist is both a figure and a real thing. That St Augustine himself did own it, and that he agrees in that point with St Ambrose, St Cyprian, and Eusebius Emesenus, some of whose passages he quotes. Whence he infers that it is the doctrine of the Fathers, though many doubt of it, who cannot apprehend how, the bread remaining visibly entire, it can be said that it is the body and blood of Christ To his letter he subjoins an abstract of his commentary upon the twenty-sixth chapter of St Matthew's Gospel, wherein he explains the words of the institution of the Eucharist, and opposes those who give them only a figurative sense, as if the words imported nothing but the figure and virtue of the body and blood of our Saviour, and not His real flesh and blood. Then he tells him that he thought himself obliged to explain that passage more at large, upon the information he had received, that some people found fault with what he had formerly written upon that subject.—*Ecclesiastical History : The Ninth Century*, ch. vii., vol. ii., p. 80.

40. This impartial account speaks for itself. It seems many years after he wrote his treatise there were many who still disbelieved his doctrine. His attempt to prove that Christ is in the consecrated elements, both in figure and reality, is most extraordinary. Dr Pusey, with Paschasius, holds that in the consecrated elements, which, he admits, the Fathers considered to be images or figures, there are also those things which are represented by the images or figures, and that whatever communicants received by the mouth the images or figures received also, after the same manner, that of which they were the images or figures. His teaching on this point will be found 35 12, 20, 31, 32, 33.

41. But what we have now to notice are the reasons which he gives for so unaccountable a belief. These, for the most part, are identical with those given by Paschasius, if they have not been taken from him. He, as we have noticed above (sec. 38), cites two of Augustine's statements from

memory, which appears to have been more convenient than accurate. Again he cites these two passages, to which he adds a third, which is, 'Afterwards believing, the Jews drank 'in the cup that which, raging, they shed on the cross.' (33 22.) Paschasius also cited Cyprian (33 19, 23), but in such a way that we cannot regard it in any other light than being exactly against him; and so Dr Pusey appears to have thought, for although he has quoted from the same epistle, he has omitted that part. Compare Paschasius' part of 33 19 with Cyprian's part of 12 6. Dr Pusey, however, has given us a portion of the same letter, and, by the assistance of a small quantity of italic type, shows what he would have his unfortunate disciples understand by it. The following is the citation, with another from Augustine: 'Nor can His blood, 'whereby we have been redeemed and quickened, appear to 'be *in* the cup, when the cup is without that wine whereby 'the blood of Christ is *set forth*.' 'S. Augustine says again, '“Receive ye that *in* the bread which hung on the cross; '“receive ye that *in* the cup which flowed from the side.”' (35 33.) Whence doth Dr Pusey obtain this extract from Augustine? Verily, he doth not tell us. In his book we have thousands of extracts from the Fathers, all of which, with few exceptions, have references attached to them. Belarmino admits that this passage is ascribed to Augustine on the authority of Paschasius. (*De Sac.* lib. ii. cap. 24, tom iii., col. 536.) Why did not Dr Pusey tell his readers that he quoted it as recorded from the memory of Paschasius, the illustrious author of the doctrine of the Real Presence? These citations are given, with others of a like kind, with the little word *in* italicised, and all duly set off so as to have a telling effect upon those who accept him as their teacher, or rather employ him as their physician, and take his prescriptions without scrutiny.

42. It should be observed that Bertram takes no notice of what Paschasius remembered of Augustine's sermon to neophytes, but as noticed above (Sec. 36) gives a most telling passage from a sermon to the same class of persons.

43. The other passage that Paschasius pretended to quote from Augustine is nowhere to be found in his writings, and

Dr Pusey, though aided by two Roman cardinals, does not pretend to give it. A phrase of this kind occurs several times. 'The same who in their rage had killed Him being 'changed, believed in Him; and the blood which in their 'raging they had shed, by believing they drank.' (21 93.) Again, 'Many of them believed, and the shedding of the blood 'of Christ was forgiven them. At first they shed it while 'they raged: now they drank it while they believed.' (21 103.) These are very different statements from that given by Paschasius, viz., that 'believing, the Jews drank in the cup 'that which raging they shed.' Augustine himself makes no mention of cup, but, that they drank the blood 'by believing' or 'while they believed,' which might be in or out of the sacrament, but in neither case could it be drunk without faith. Dr Pusey cites Augustine almost as unfairly as Paschasius does by leaving out the significant word *by*, though it actually stands in a translation from which he professedly quotes, and of which he is one of the editors. (21 93.)

44. Bertram himself answers Paschasius on the point under consideration by quoting two passages from the Missal of his day, which, with his remarks thereon, will be found 25 50-53.

45. We are now to examine the testimony of Rabanus Maurus. If, of all the divines and commentators of the ninth century, it be of importance that we have the greatest and the best to bear testimony in this controversy, Rabanus is the person. We are told in a preface to the English translation of the famous *Catena Aurea* of Thomas Aquinas, edited and translated in most part by Dr Newman: 'If any book might 'be supposed to have been his (Aquinas') guide more than 'another, it would be Rabanus Maurus.' (p. vi.) Aquinas, the angelic doctor, was no mean judge in such matters. Strabo, a pupil and amanuensis of Rabanus, also compiled a commentary, consisting chiefly of an abridgment of that of Rabanus. This formed the common exegetical manual of the middle ages, known as the *Glossa Ordinaria*, and is usually printed with that most valuable commentary of Nicolas De Lyra, to which our Reformers were so much indebted—

‘Si Lyra non lyrasset.
Lutherus non saltasset.’

Mosheim gives him the first rank among the philosophers of his age, and says that his ‘fame was great through all Germany and France, and to whom the youth resorted, in prodigious numbers, from all parts, to receive his instructions in ‘the liberal arts and sciences.’

46. Archbishop Usher in his ‘Answer to a Challenge made ‘by a Jesuit,’ informs us, on the authority of one of that tribe, that manuscripts then about to be printed were first to be *purged*. Our edition of the works of Rabanus is one of this kind, and consequently we find in it no direct answers to Paschasius. Some of these we have obtained elsewhere, and they are given. (26 31-33.)

47. It will be most convenient to notice these first. Paschasius had maintained that the consecrated elements were not digested in the ordinary way. (33 12.) Rabanus plainly states that the sentiment and the notion out of which it arose had their origin in his day. He gives the outrageous statement of Paschasius in his words, and states that he had written a letter to Egilus in opposition to it. (26 31, 32.) Then by way of correcting so gross and carnal a notion of eating Christ’s real Body and Blood in which He was crucified, he cites an important passage from St John’s Gospel, and in the words of Augustine applies it to prove the real spiritual and immaterial nature of Christ’s Body and Blood, and which only can be received by those who are spiritual and faithful. (26 32, 33.)

48. The citations from Rabanus which we have now to examine are in no respect controversial, and have no direct reference to the heresy of Paschasius. They are the unbiassed utterances of an illustrious and learned divine and philosopher, who wished to instruct his fellowmen in the truths of our holy religion, as set forth in Holy Scripture, and verily maintained and held by the chief doctors of the ancient church, especially by the great Augustine.

49. The reader will do well to bear in mind the main difference there is between Bertram, and Dr Pusey and Paschasius on the doctrine of the Real Presence. The latter contend,

as we have seen, that the material body in which Christ was, when He said, 'This is my body,' and 'It is finished,' is present really and actually and not only represented or signified by sacraments, mysteries, signs, symbols or images. The former maintains the real and actual absence of that body, in the consecrated elements, and its presence, if such it can be called, only in sacrament, mystery, or figure, &c., that is sacramentally, mystically, or figuratively, &c. Bertram expressly holds that Christ is spiritually the meat and drink of believers both in and out of the sacraments, which sentiment is well expressed in our Liturgy of 1552, 'For that He hath given His son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God's word as by the holy sacraments of His blessed body and blood.' This liturgy was used 110 years.

50. We are now to show that this doctrine and that of Bertram generally was truly held by Rabanus. Very much to our convenience he has given us a canon or rule of interpretation respecting the figurative language of Scripture. This is laid down in his elaborate work of 'Instruction for the Clergy,' consisting of three books divided into 150 chapters embracing the rites, ceremonies, and sacraments of the Church, also biblical criticism, grammar, and philosophy, including the useful if not the necessary knowledge of a clergyman for those days. (26 30.) This canon is taken from Augustine; now both he and his worthy disciple Rabanus have not selected this text for its own sake, on the ground that there was any dispute as to whether it should be understood literally or figuratively. With them there was no doubt but that it should be interpreted as a figurative form of speech, and was selected by them as an instance beyond all dispute, and therefore admirably fitted as an undoubted instance of a figurative form of speech. Thus on the words 'Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you.' It is said, 'He seems to command what is horrible or flagitious, therefore it is figurative.' (26 30.) This is how the text *is not* to be interpreted. Then what is considered to be the right interpretation? Do Augustine of the fourth

century, and Rabanus of the ninth, teach as Dr Pusey and Paschasius do, that we are to eat the real flesh or body of the Son of man ‘not after the manner of a body, but spiritually,’ or ‘as a spiritual body yet not received after the manner of a ‘body?’ Verily no, but we are commanded ‘to communicate ‘in the passion of the Lord, and sweetly and profitably to ‘treasure up in our memory, that His flesh was crucified and ‘wounded for us.’ (26 30.) It is needless to remark that this canon of interpretation equally applies to the eating of Christ’s flesh or body, and drinking His blood in His Holy Supper. Therefore when in St John we read of eating and drinking Christ’s flesh and blood, and when we eat the sacraments or mysteries of His body and blood, which Augustine calls *visible words* (21 10, 39, 101), we are given to understand by Augustine and his imitator Rabanus, that we do not literally eat and drink Christ’s body and blood but rather with the mind and understanding, ‘communicate in the passion of the ‘Lord, and sweetly and profitably treasure up in our mind, ‘that His flesh was crucified and slain for us.’

51. It would be interesting to know how these sentiments were regarded when the doctrine of the Real Presence had become general. We have an instance about 200 years after the time of Rabanus. Thus Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, is represented as quoting the words which follow: ‘Except ye ‘shall eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ‘ye shall not have life in you.’ He seems to ‘command what ‘is horrible or flagitious. It is therefore a figure, *the heretic will say*, commanding us *only* to communicate in the passion ‘of the Lord, and sweetly and profitably to treasure up in ‘our mind, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us.’ (*Fulbert’s Sermons. Bib. Mag. Vet. Patr.* tom. xi., p. 44.) It is most probable, however, that some Jesuit interpolated Fulbert, and thus charged Augustine and Rabanus with heresy.

52. It is important to notice, that both by Rabanus and Augustine the words bread, flesh, and blood, in St John’s Gospel, in relation to Christ, and the consecrated bread and wine, or as they are sacramentally called body and blood, are identically the same in signification, and that what is signified by them may be received by faith either through the word

written or (as Augustine seems to conceive of it) the word spoken or sounded, or the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which Augustine, in contrast with the words spoken or sounded, calls visible words, (21 10, 39, 101.) and as a matter of course ranks them as significant, with ordinary words and other signs. (21 8, 9, 10, 12, 18.)

53. Rabanus states, that 'manna is that which Christ is, 'who, as the living bread, came down from heaven, who, 'through the evangelical clouds [the apostles and their writings] is rained on the whole world and received by a believing Church.' (26 3.) In another interpretation of the same text, he brings out the same idea ; and here manna is represented as 'heavenly discourses' by which the spiritually-minded are fed in the public teaching of the Church. (26 4.)

54. Thus again, on the text, 'man doth not live by bread 'alone,' &c., he remarks that the 'manna given from heaven 'signifies Christ,' the eating of whose flesh, and the drinking of whose blood, produces eternal life, but only to those who are by faith in Christ's body. (26 5.) To this text he also gives a secondary interpretation, which reiterates the same sentiments as the first. Here he instructs us that the soul cannot live but by the Word of God, 'For man consists of 'body and soul ; whence this which is of the earth is nourished 'by earthly food ; the soul cannot live except by the Word of 'God. For the Spirit of God gives life to the spirit of man 'which dwelleth in him ; if, however, the man himself is in 'the body of Christ, and lives by faith on the Son of God.' (26 5.) In these instances, we certainly have no direct reference to Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament, or sacramentally, but to His flesh and blood in the Word spiritually received by faith.

55. On a striking text cited from Jeremiah as it stands in the Latin Bible, he gives an exposition which he calls, and rightly so, the consensus of all the churches. (26 6.) Here he quotes a passage from the writings of Origen, in which Christ is represented as bread, bread crucified, and bread as doctrine or teaching made known throughout the whole world.' (26 6, cited from Origen, 11 45.)

56. Rabanus, however, makes an essential difference between

bread for the sacrament, or sacramental bread, and Christ Himself. Thus he says, 'give us this day what we receive 'daily, either for the sacrament of the body of Christ, or for 'spiritual food. (26 7, 8.) But this spiritual food he knows, is the Bread of Life which came down from heaven. Consecrated bread, then, in the sacrament, is not Christ the Bread of Life, but rather a sign or symbol of it; but Bread out of the sacrament as a title of Christ means Christ Himself, and to a certainty, whoever takes It takes Christ. But Rabanus, who here follows his teacher, Augustine, not only gives us to understand that daily bread is spiritual bread, which is Christ, the Bread of Life, but that this is received as divine precepts, which are to be daily practised, and daily meditated upon. (See Ch. vii. 70.)

57. Again, Rabanus describes Christ as the supersubstantial bread, not at all meaning that which is called bread in the sacrament, but Christ personally, and what He is to those who are spiritually hungry, which Bread can be obtained by faith either in, or out of, the sacrament. (26 8.) Rabanus still following Augustine in his remarks on the words 'daily bread,' distinguished between bread used in the sacrament and bread which, though not food for the stomach, is, nevertheless, food for the mind, and he cherished the hope of being with Christ when sacramental and verbal signs or symbols would be required no longer. (26 16.)

58. We have now to notice instances where he undoubtedly speaks of the flesh and blood of Christ in relation to the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ (26 18, 19), but in these and other instances, he distinguishes between the material part of the sacrament which only nourishes the body, and that which the sacrament signifies, the spiritual food of Christ Himself as the Bread of Life (26 18, 19, 22, 23, 25), and shows that while any communicant can receive the sign, yet only the faithful can receive the thing signified, that is Christ Himself the Bread of Life. Thus in the clear and emphatic words of the great Augustine, he states, 'The sacrament or 'sign of the thing is taken from the Lord's table by some to 'life, by some to death, but the thing Itself is to every man 'to life, to no man to destruction, whoever shall be a partaker

'of it.' 26 21.) If the unbelieving or wicked communicant could receive by the mouth not only the sacrament or sign, but with it also the thing signified, as Dr Pusey and his school maintain, such a statement by the acute Augustine, and the repetition of it by his learned disciple in the ninth century is utterly unaccountable.

59. But Rabanus, for the special instruction of the clergy on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, goes on to enlarge upon the statement of Augustine, as might be necessary for those times. He says, 'For the sacrament is received by the mouth, 'the inner man is satisfied with the virtue of the sacrament. 'For the sacrament is reduced into the nutriment of the body, 'but the dignity of eternal life is attained by the virtue of 'the sacrament. . . . Therefore, as the sacrament is changed 'into us when we eat and drink it, so also we are changed 'into the body of Christ, whilst we live obediently and piously.' (26 22, 23.) But is not Rabanus speaking disparagingly of the sacrament of the body of Christ? and would not the clergy of his day think so, for whose more especial benefit he was writing? Not at all, and that he may not be misunderstood, he goes on to say, 'But yet the dignity and power of the 'sacrament itself, as we have said above, are so great, that 'whoever receives it unworthily rather procures condemnation than salvation.' (26 23.) As an absolute certainty, Rabanus believed and taught that the sacrament merely, or outward sign only, could be received by the wicked. But if the sacrament was also what it signified, and really contained it, as Dr Pusey and all disciples of Paschasius maintain, verily this most famous and able man did not believe it, nor did he so understand Augustine.

60. Rabanus, as well as Bertram, and both like Augustine, speak of the *virtue* of the sacrament in contrast with what is seen and is material (26 17, 21, 22; he quotes Augustine 21 75, 78.) Thus to speak of the thing signified is not compatible with the modern belief of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, and so thought Paschasius, and therefore affects to reject it. (33 28, 29.)

61. Like Bertram, Rabanus gives peculiar prominence to his belief that the body of believers is as much signified, or is

the reality of which the sacrament is a sign, in the consecrated elements, as the body of Christ is, and is as much present. Nay, he rigidly maintains that the sacrament cannot be rightly celebrated unless both be had in view, as the one reality of which the consecrated elements are the symbols or signs. (26 10, 13, quoted from Bede ; 24 28 ; 26 21, 24, 26, 27.) This indissoluble union of Christ and His members is especially signified in the sacrament. But if Christ is really present in the sacrament, so also are His members. But they are not really present, so no more is Christ really present. If Rabanus held a Real Presence at all in the consecrated elements, it is that of true believers ; for quoting probably the words of Augustine addressed to those only who were believed to be members of the body of Christ, he says—‘There are ye ‘on the table, and there are ye in the cup.’ (26 13 ; cites Bede 24 28.) The same sentiment is brought out very strongly in the words of Augustine. (26 21, 22.)

62. Dr Pusey explains the phrase ‘communion of the body ‘of Christ,’ so as to teach that in the sacrament Christ’s real body is received by the mouth of the communicant. (35 17). But this ‘communion,’ as interpreted by the context and by Rabanus, is inclusive of Christ’s believing people, also called His body. (26 24.) No one pretends that these are really present in the consecrated elements.

63. Again quoting the language and sentiment of Cyprian, we learn beyond all question that if the real body of Christ is present, so also must be present the real bodies of all His members in Him. (26 26 ; 12 6.) From the reference to Cyprian, it will be seen that Dr Pusey has quoted one part of his testimony ; but had he quoted fairly, as Rabanus has done, the reader would have seen that Cyprian is against, not for him. Dr Pusey regards Cyprian as having been ‘guided by ‘revelations along the whole course of an anxious episcopate,’ and believes him to have been seen ‘thrice since death in ‘glory ; and to whom it had been given to sit on the throne ‘of the Judge, and is now an assessor of the Judge.’ (*Preface to the translation of the Epistles of Cyprian*, pp. xxi. xxii.) This witness, so inspired and so exalted, in his estimation, he quotes so as to give only a fraction of the truth, as follows—

‘Nor can His blood, whereby we have been redeemed and quickened, appear to be *in* the cup, when the cup is without wine, whereby the blood of Christ is set forth.’ (35 33. See Cyprian 12 2-7.)

64. But this sentence, pointed by emphatic type, and placed with other sentences treated after the same fashion, quite falsifies the real testimony of Cyprian, and in this way Dr Pusey uses the weight of Cyprian’s name with his words, though employed in a sense, and for a purpose which he never intended, to fix in the mind of the reader, that the wine in the consecrated cup was real blood. Rabanus has quoted from the same epistle of Cyprian, but, not like Dr Pusey, has given enough of the context to show the real meaning. He cites—‘We see that in the water the people are understood, but in the wine is shown the blood of Christ.’ (26 26). No amount of emphatic sound or type could make it appear that the believing people are really *in* the cup, and certainly no such slender expedients can really make it appear that the true blood of Christ is *in* the cup, and such a petty shift on the part of Dr Pusey is contemptible.

65. Here a very awkward question arises for Dr Pusey’s teacher, himself, and unfortunate followers. If in the Lord’s Supper the wine after consecration was verily and universally believed to be changed into, or become the real blood of Christ, as Paschasius and Dr Pusey confidently assert, how was it that some of Cyprian’s people, in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, consecrated water without any wine? and that Cyprian had to use his great influence and episcopal eloquence (‘so tender and so touching,’ that on this account Augustine cited it in his writings with admiration) to convince them that the cup should be mingled with wine? And to give effect to his strong appeal, he prefaces it by showing that he spoke not as an ordinary mortal, but as one who had been ‘enjoined by the inspiration and command of God,’ (12 2), which Dr Pusey points out as one instance out of many in which he was ‘guided by revelations along the whole course of an anxious episcopate.’ This is a strong, though indirect proof, that Dr Pusey’s doctrine was not known.

66. Rabanus taught as Bertram did, that the Rock stood

exactly in the same relation to the believing Israelites in the Church in the wilderness as consecrated wine in the Lord's Supper does to believing communicants, and that both were alike spiritual and signified or represented the same thing. Hence, on 1 Cor. x. 1-4, quoting from Augustine, he states, 'See then the signs varied, while the faith is the same [viz., the thing to be believed]. There the Rock was Christ; 'to us that is Christ which is placed on the altar of God.' (26 12; 21 94.) The same parallel and exact comparison he states in the words of Augustine respecting the manna in the wilderness and the consecrated bread in the Lord's Supper. "This is the bread which came down from heaven." This 'bread the manna signified; this bread the altar of God doth signify. Those were sacraments; in signs they are diverse, 'in the thing signified they are alike.' (26 17; 21 77.)

67. Bertram obtained strong evidence against Paschasius from the definition Isidore had given of the Christian sacraments or mysteries. (25 23-25.) Rabanus in his instruction to the clergy, gives the same, or nearly the same, definition. (26 18, 28, 29.) Baptism, which we consider to be one sacrament, Rabanus, as was the custom from the time of Cyprian downwards, with Isidore, speaks of as two sacraments, so also of the Lord's Supper. (26 19.) The definition which he gives of a sacrament, expressed in the words of Augustine (26 29) is equally applicable to all four, viz., to the water and oil of baptism, to the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, as visible and material signs, and to the respective things signified by those signs. We have not the remotest hint in this definition, nor can we gather from it that water consecrated in baptism is changed into, or becomes that which it represents or signifies, or that oil by consecration is converted into or becomes really the Holy Ghost. No one pretends that this is the case. No more grounds have we for concluding that by consecration the bread and wine become Christ's body and blood. Dr Pusey had made so much of the act of consecration as named by Cyril of Jerusalem, in regard to the bread and wine, that naturally supposing his readers would make as much of the act of consecration in regard to the oil and conclude that as it, after

consecration, is called 'Christ's gift of grace,' it was really the gift of grace, he tells them 'it was not so, but only an 'instrument of it.' (35 37.) No more is the bread the body of Christ, though Cyril calls it so.

68. The way in which Rabanus accounts for Christ bearing the title of Bread and the Vine (26 1), and the way in which he explains the elements in the Lord's Supper in relation to those titles, shows how oblivious he must have been of this doctrine of the Real Presence. Thus the bread in the sacrament he explains in relation to Christ the Bread of life, and the wine in relation to the vine, as Cyprian had done before him. (26 25 ; 12 2.) But if the consecrated bread really became the Body, Soul, and Divinity of Christ, and the wine after consecration became so in like manner, it would be most incongruous to associate such stern realities with such metaphors as Bread and a Vine divinely applied to Christ.

69. The way in which he, with Isidore, defines a sacrifice in relation to the Lord's Supper, comes vastly short of what these modern sacrificers require. With him a sacrifice is a sacred doing, which may be applied to every holy act of a Christian. (26 28 ; 25 23.)

70. Then as to the sacrifice of Christ being repeated, perpetuated, or continued, in the Lord's Supper, he cites from Chrysostom two passages utterly fatal to any such notion. (26 14, 15 ; 22 34, 35.) These extracts from Chrysostom form no part of Dr Pusey's 400 pages of *Catena Patrum* in defence of the doctrine of the Real Presence and its co-relatives.

71. The distance between Rabanus Maurus and Paschasius on the questions in dispute is as wide as the poles. If one of them was right, the other was an unmitigated heretic. It is certain Rabanus was more in accordance with holy Scripture, and if truth, facts, and unimpeachable evidence are of any value, then it is also certain that Rabanus substantially represented the general teaching of the early Christian Church in relation to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and that Paschasius misrepresented it. It seems almost incredible that such a teacher should have been held up and recognised by those who hold the doctrine of the Real Presence as the most illustrious defender of it. For what do we find in his writ-

ings which have come down to us ? An attempt at adducing patristic evidence in favour of his doctrine, which is manifestly a signal failure ; an extremely clumsy endeavour and fruitless result to answer objections to his doctrines adduced by his friend from Augustine ; fables, which appear to us as blasphemous, such as Christ having been seen in a visible form in the shape of a lamb, and in the colour of flesh and blood ; that in answer to the prayer of a presbyter Christ appeared as a little boy in the sacrament, whom he took into his arms, pressed to his bosom and kissed, and after having again placed the child on the table, in answer to prayer it appeared again in the form of bread, which this presbyter did eat. (33 10, 11.) But if such a doctrine did not exist from the beginning, and is not to be found in holy Scripture, and was unknown in the Christian Church for 800 years, what better or more plausible beginning could it have had, than that given it by Paschasius, who we maintain was the author and inventor of it.

72. Such is the origin and history of this controversy. Strange as it may appear, in about two hundred years the doctrine of Paschasius became the general doctrine of the Roman Church. It will be well to notice the controversy in this advanced stage. Berenger, a pupil of Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, took sides with Bertram, and more especially Scotus and the early Church. Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury ; and Guitmond, archbishop of Averse, took sides with Paschasius, and became the hot defenders of this new heresy. What were the opinions of Berenger we can only learn from these his two opponents, who undertook to answer him. From Lanfranc we learn that he maintained—

‘That the sacrifice of the Church consists of two things, is made (*conficitur*) in two things—a visible sacrament and the reality of the ‘sacrament. Which reality, however—that is, the body of Christ—if ‘it were before our eyes, it should be visible ; but being taken up into ‘heaven, and sitting at the right hand of the Father until the times ‘of the restitution of all things of which the Apostle Peter writes, it ‘cannot be called down from heaven, as the person of Christ consists ‘of God and man. Whence the blessed Augustine, in the gospel, ‘says, “When Christ is eaten, life is eaten ;” “nor when we eat do “we make parts of Him.” (21 139.) “Whence the blessed Augustine, in his book on the city of God, says, “A sacrament is a sacred “sign.” (21 28.) He defines a sign, in his book on Christian Doc-

'trine, thus: "A sign is a thing which, besides the form which it presents to the senses, causes something else external to itself to come into the mind." (21 9.) Augustine, in his Epistle to Bishop Boniface, says, "If sacraments had not a certain resemblance to those things of which they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all." (21 3.) Again, concerning catechizing the unlearned, he says, "That things visible are indeed signs of Divine realities, but that in the signs the invisible realities themselves are honoured; nor is the form consecrated by blessing so to be esteemed of as it is esteemed of in any ordinary use." (21 26.) Whence the blessed Augustine, in his Epistle to Boniface, says: "As the sacrament of the body of Christ, after a certain manner, is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ, after a certain manner, is the blood of Christ; so the sacrament of faith is faith." (21 3.)

73. To this last extract Lanfranc gives the following answer, which the reader is requested to notice, as the part in italics is actually cited by Dr Pusey as a statement of Augustine: '*Lanfranc.*—The sacrament of the body of Christ is His flesh as far as it has respect to that which was on the cross, the Lord Christ Himself having been sacrificed, which flesh we receive in the sacrament concealed in the form of bread, and *we drink his blood under the form and flavour of wine.* (35 23.) We shall only give one more of Berenger's citations from Augustine: 'Christ was sacrificed once in His own person, and yet in the sacrament is sacrificed by the people, not only through all the solemnities of the Passover, but every day.' (21 3.—*Lanfranci De Eucharist. Sacrament. Bib. Mag. Vet. Patr.*, tom XI., pp. 341, 342.)

74. These sentiments are what Lanfranc was pleased to cite from Berenger. To know what were the opinions on the other side it will be sufficient to cite a form of faith which a council, held at Rome in the year 1059, of 113 bishops, compelled Berenger to accept; which, had he not accepted, it is probable he would have been submitted to the flames, as were his writings and those of his favourite author, Joannes Scotus. The form of faith recorded by Lanfranc is:

'I, Berenger, an unworthy deacon of the Church of St. Maurice of Angiers, knowing the true Catholic and Apostolic faith, I anathematize all heresy, particularly that of which I have been suspected, which attempts to construe that the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar are, after consecration, only the sacrament, and not the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor could it,

‘except in the sacrament only, according to the bodily senses (*sensu-aliter*), be touched by the hands of the priests, or broken or ground by the teeth of the faithful. But I consent to the holy Roman Church and the Apostolic See, and confess with my mouth and heart that I hold that faith concerning the sacraments of the Lord’s Table, which my lord and venerable Pope Nicolas and this holy synod have declared, and assured me that I ought to hold according to the Evangelical and apostolic authority; namely, that the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar are, after consecration, not only the sacrament, but also the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, according to the bodily senses (*sensu-aliter*) are touched by the hands of the priests, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful, not only in the sacrament, but in reality, which I swear by the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity, and by these holy gospels of Christ. I [pronounce that they who advance against this faith deserve, with their doctrines and followers, an eternal curse; and if I myself should presume at any time to preach or think anything contrary to these things, I submit myself to the utmost rigour of the canons. Having read, and read thoroughly, I have subscribed.]’
—*Ibid.*, tom xi. p. 338.

75. Notwithstanding this abjuration, Berenger did not thereby renounce his real sentiments, but propagated them with all the more zeal. Again and again he has to abjure his opinions, but he still held and taught them. Guitmond composed an answer to him in three books, from which we may further learn how gross and carnal the doctrine of the Real Presence was. The answer is conducted in the form of a dialogue, from which, in part, we learn the sentiments of Berenger, as well as the gross answers thereto. Again, he is represented as citing Augustine as follows: ‘Augustine, in his book on Christian Doctrine, names the food of the Lord’s altar, figure, and sign, saying, “But at this time, &c.”’ [For the remainder see 21 12, 13, the whole sections.] Thou hast heard, therefore, they say that it is a figure: what more dost thou require? Add yet, that among all ecclesiastical authors, and also in the prayers of the mass which the Church celebrates everywhere, the bread of the altar is called a sacrament—that is, a sacred sign.’—(*Guitmundi De veritate Eucharist.*, lib. ii, *Bib.*, &c., tom xi. p. 359.)

76. What remains further to be given it best becomes a Papist to express, and for this purpose Dupin is employed, who says:—

‘In the second book, Guitmond answers an objection made by Berenger, viz., that “the flesh of Jesus Christ is incorruptible, but “the sacraments of the altar are corruptible if they be kept too long.” To this Guitmond replies, that though the consecrated bread seems to be corrupted to the apprehension of corrupted men, yet in reality it is not changed at all; and that it does not appear altered, unless as a punishment of the infidelity and negligence of men. That it cannot be gnawn by mice and other vermin; and if at any time it appears to be so, it is only to punish the negligence, or to try the faith of men. Nor will he admit that the fire can consume these mysteries; and he says, that with veneration they commit it to this most pure element, to be carried up into heaven. Lastly, he affirms that though the Eucharist may serve for nourishment, yet it does not turn to excrement; and as to that objection which might be made, “That “supposing a man should eat nothing for some considerable time “but consecrated bread, he would, nevertheless, have occasion to go “to stool.” He answers that it is a matter of fact that has never been experienced, and that it could never enter the heart of any Catholic to try such an experiment. That if any of Berenger’s party thought fit to do it, one should not trouble one’s head much about what became of the mass of those infidels, which committed so great a crime; because, says he, we do not believe that the bread and wine are necessarily changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, unless among those who have the faith to believe this mystery, and that the words of Jesus Christ are efficacious. That, lastly, if any of them should order a Catholic priest to consecrate one or more great loaves, to try the experiment, it is to be believed that this loaf would not be turned into excrement; or rather, that God would permit these heretics to be deceived, by ordering some angel or spirit to convey away this consecrated loaf, and to put an unconsecrated one in its stead.—*Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii. p. 203.

77. From this it will be seen that about two hundred years after Paschasius had, for the first time in the history of the Church, propounded so monstrous a doctrine, yet that very doctrine was adopted, in all its hideousness, by a council of 113 bishops, presided over by Pope Nicolas; and the infamous transaction is duly recorded in the Roman *‘Corpus Juris Canonici Decreti,’ Tert. pars, De Consecr., Dis. II. can. 42, cols. 1932, 1933.*

78. The Romanists of more modern times have felt the confession, so rudely thrust into the mouth of Berenger, to be so indecently gross that they have put a gloss upon it, of which they have a great variety. If the text happens to state, as in the case before us, what is not convenient to be

believed, the gloss in the margin is so judiciously chosen as to make it in accordance with the exact recognised teaching of Rome.

79. We have now to examine the testimony of Bede, surnamed the Venerable out of respect to his character and memory, and sometimes called the English Doctor, in respect of his learning and influence in this country. A bishop of St. Andrews, in the twelfth century, remarks: 'Venerable Bede, while alive, was concealed in the farthest corner of the world, but after his death he became known in every part of it, and still lives in his writings.' His published works appear in six folio volumes. The fifth and sixth, from which only we have made extracts, consist of commentaries on the New Testament, chiefly extracted from the writings of Augustine, especially the sixth volume, containing the Epistles of St. Paul.

80. Augustine has entered more fully and completely into the explanation of the Holy Scriptures, in relation to the participation of Christ's body and blood—whether in the Word of God, the sacrament of Baptism, or that of the Lord's Supper—than any other early Father, and is generally admitted to be by far the most important of all the early witnesses in relation to the points under consideration. As preliminary to a more full examination of Augustine and other ancient Fathers, we shall find it most useful and important to confer with Bede, and ascertain, as we best can, the application and use which he made of Augustine in the elucidation of certain texts in relation to the Lord's Supper at a time when, as we believe, the doctrine of the Real Presence had not been invented.

81. We shall begin with an examination of the nature of sacraments as defined and explained by Bede in the words of Augustine. In the sacrament of Baptism we are told that it is not the water which is the instrument of cleansing, but the word; for it is said, 'take away the word, and what is the water but water?' (24 23; 21 101). With Augustine, what the word was to the ear, when uttered, the water, as explained in its meaning and intent by the word, when seen,

was to the eye of a believer ; and, hence, he calls it a visible word.

82. As a comment on Romans vi. 5, in connection with the sacrament of Baptism, we are instructed that that and other sacraments receive the names of that which they signify (not that they are believed to be the things which they signify); to illustrate which it is added : ‘ After a certain manner the ‘ sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, &c., ‘ so the sacrament of faith is faith.’ But we learn that the sacrament of faith was not real faith any more than the sacrament of Baptism was death and burial with Christ, although, as the sacrament of so great a thing, it was so called. (24 22 ; 21 3).

83. The reader should note well the many passages Bede has cited from Augustine, in which the words ‘ signs ’ and ‘ sacraments ’ are used interchangeably, and their nature and use explained. He speaks of the manna and rock as signs (24 24 ; 21 23) and as sacraments. (24 12, 24 ; 21 78). Sacraments used as signs are thus explained : ‘ A thing which ‘ is a sign is accustomed to be called by the name of the thing ‘ which it signifies ; as it is written “ The rock was ‘ “ Christ.” For he did not say the rock signified Christ, ‘ but, as it were, was this very thing, though indeed it was ‘ not this in substance, but in signification.’ (24 24 ; 21 23.) Again : ‘ All things which represent other things appear in a ‘ certain manner to sustain the character of those things which ‘ they signify, as it is said by the apostle, ‘ that rock was ‘ Christ,’ since the rock of which this was spoken signified ‘ Christ.’ (24 24 ; 21 31.) Further : ‘ It is not said the rock ‘ signified Christ, but “ the rock was Christ ; ” neither is it ‘ said, the good seed signifies the children of the kingdom ‘ but it is said “ the good seed, these are the children ‘ “ of the kingdom.” As then Scripture is wont to speak, ‘ calling the things signifying as if they were the things signi- ‘ fied.’ (24 24 ; 21 100.) Thus again he asks : ‘ How is the ‘ bread His body ? and the cup, or what the cup contains, ‘ how is it His blood ? These things, brethren, are therefore ‘ called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another ‘ understood.’ (24 26 ; 21 135.)

84. It is certain that the sacraments of Christ in the wilderness were not really that of which they were the sacraments; the same is true of the sacraments of Christ's body and blood in the Christian Church. Bede quotes many passages from Augustine, which show to a certainty, that the two sacraments of the Israelitish Church, though different in form, were in signification the same as the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ; that in each case the spiritual food which they represented was spiritually the same, and alike incapable of being received except spiritually. In proof, we shall only refer to the citations, which the reader will do well to consider, and also observe the texts here and throughout under which Bede, for their elucidation, has placed the remarks of Augustine. (24 7; 21 70; 24 12; 21 77, 78; 24 24; 21 53, 94; 24 11, 24; 21 74, 75.)

85. Bede, through his great teacher, gives peculiar prominence to the union of believers with Christ, and if we are literally to take the sacramental language employed to signify or represent it, utterly disregarding the clear and full explanation Augustine and Bede have given of the nature and use of such language, as Paschasius and Dr Pusey have done, we should be certain that Bede and his Instructor believed in the real presence of the bodies, souls, and spirits of believers in the consecrated elements. Thus they say, 'Believers know 'the body of Christ,' both in and out of the sacrament, 'if they 'neglect not to be the body of Christ.' (24 13, 28; 21 79, 80.) They explain the meat and drink of Christ, whether received in or out of the sacrament, as making those who receive them immortal and incorruptible, and that this fellowship is especially betokened in the sacrament as it appears was taught by Augustine's early predecessors. (24 15, 28; 21 83. See also 24 17, 29; 21 85.) Again, 'What the Lord hath 'given us to understand in the eating of His flesh, and 'drinking of His blood, is, that we should dwell in Him, 'and He in us. Now, we dwell in Him, when we are His 'members, and He dwelleth in us when we are His temple. '... For the Spirit maketh living members.' (24 20; 21 89.) This union is also especially depicted in 24 33; 21 47, 116; 24 34; 21 115. Again, teacher and

disciple state, 'By this meat and drink, then, He would have 'to be understood the fellowship of His body and members; 'which is the holy Church in His saints and faithful ones.' (24 28; 21 82.) But these illustrious men, if we understand their sacramental language contrary to their own rules respecting it, as Romanists and Romanizers do, speak of the members of Christ as being actually and really on the table and in the cup, thus they say to those whom they take for true believers,

'If, then, you wish to understand the body of Christ, hear the Apostle 'saying to the faithful, "Ye are the body of Christ and His members." 'If, therefore, ye are the body of Christ and His members, the mystery of yourselves is placed upon the Lord's Table; ye receive the 'mystery of yourselves. To that which ye are, ye answer, Amen, and 'by answering, subscribe to it. 'Be what you see, and take what you 'are.' 'Many separate grapes hang upon a bunch, but the juice of 'them is mingled together into one. So hath the Lord Christ represented us, wished us to belong to Himself, consecrated upon His 'table the mystery of peace and our unity.' (24 26; 21 136, 137.) Again, 'Christ hath commended unto us in this sacrament His own 'body and blood, which also he hath even made us ourselves. For 'we also have been made His body; and through His mercy we are 'what we receive. "Ye have come to the cup of the Lord, and there 'ye are on the table, and there ye are in the cup.'" (24 28.)

According to the plain teaching of these men, in whatever sense the body of Christ is present in the Lord's Supper, there present also are His true members, but no one believes that these are actually and really present, and surely no one has ground for believing that the body of Christ is actually and really present, and without His members.

86. It is plain from Bede and his teacher, that if we communicate rightly in the Lord's Supper, we are not thereby so much made partakers of Christ's body and blood as we signify that fact, and call it to mind for our comfort and encouragement, and with others in the same happy position have fellowship, or become partakers in common, and in this way obtain life more abundantly. Bede gives a remarkable statement, which implies that all who come rightly to the Lord's table, must first be made partakers of Christ's body and blood. Thus he says, 'No one should doubt that every one of the faithful is 'made a partaker of the Lord's body and blood, when in baptism he is made a member of Christ, nor is alienated from

‘the fellowship of that bread and cup, although before he eats that bread and drinks that cup, being constituted in the unity of the body of Christ, he is cut off from this world. He surely is not deprived of the benefit and participation of that sacrament, since he himself has obtained this, which that sacrament signifies.’ (24 27.)

87. Bede further shows in the words of Augustine, that Christ can be eaten by faith without the sacrament: ‘Why make ready thy teeth and belly? Believe and thou hast eaten.’ (24 6; 21 69; see also 24 10; 21 73.)

88. These Romanists and Romanizers believe that whatever communicants, whether saints or sinners, receive the consecrated elements, receive the whole Christ; for we are told, ‘under those external forms, there is the *true, real, and substantial* Presence of Christ’s Body and Blood animated by the soul, and both pervaded by the living DEITY. Whole CHRIST, GOD, and MAN.’ (39 9.) An unaccountable belief, certainly, but a necessary part of the credulity of those who hold this incredible doctrine of the Real Presence in bread and wine. We have already seen enough from Augustine, as quoted by Bede, to be certain of the distinction both of them make between the two parts of the sacrament, viz., the sign or symbol, and the reality or thing signified, and that only the sign can be received by the wicked, and the reality with the sign only by the devout communicant. In the extracts from the exhortations to candidates for the Lord’s Supper just noticed, we have seen how they were addressed as being the Lord’s body, and that as such the mystery of themselves was placed upon the table, and in partaking of it they received the mystery of themselves. But it was only by *being* what they saw, viz., that which on the table represented the body of Christ, of which they were a part, that they could *take* what they were. Plainly in the mind of Augustine and Bede, they could not really take what they were not; if with the Lord’s body and blood, they were mystically ‘on the table, and there in the cup,’ they could, of course, receive the signs and the realities signified by them. But if they were not a portion of Christ’s mystical body, they were not on the table nor in the cup, and therefore could not receive the mys-

tery of themselves, though they might receive the consecrated signs commonly called in Holy Scripture, and by the Fathers generally, Christ's body and blood, to their condemnation. Let the reader mark well the doctrine on this point which Bede inculcates through his teacher. 'He receiveth the food 'of life, and drinketh the cup of eternity, who dwelleth in 'Christ, and whose Indweller Christ is. For he who differs 'from Christ, neither eateth His flesh nor drinketh His blood, 'although he may daily indiscriminately receive the sacrament 'of so great a thing to the condemnation of his own presumption.' (24 32; 21 21.) Nothing could be more decisive.

89. We are further very plainly instructed that the sacraments both of the Israelitish and Christian Church, are common, and can be received by all, but not so the grace, or thing signified, it being confined to the faithful only. (24 25; 21 54.) Dr Pusey has not yet maintained, as his teacher Paschasius, and his disciple, Mr Bennett, has, that what is visible in the consecrated elements is really the Body, Soul, and Divinity of Christ. But Bede cites with confidence his great master to show that what is visible of the consecrated elements is the only part which the unspiritual, merely carnal, unbelieving communicant can receive. He can eat outwardly what is seen, he can employ his material nature to eat what is material, but the immaterial spiritual part of the sacrament requiring to be 'understood spiritually,' 'received spiritually,' 'tasted spiritually,' can only be accepted by one who has a 'sanctified moral nature.' (24 12, 24; 21 78; 24 11; 21 74; 24 16, 28; 21 84.)

90. Bede cites instances from Augustine, from which we learn that there are two ways of eating Christ's body and blood; one eating the outward symbols only, the other receiving with the symbols the things signified by them, 'Let all 'this, I say, hereunto avail us, that we eat not the flesh and 'blood of Christ only in the sacrament which thing do also 'many evil men, but that even unto participation of the 'spirit we do eat and drink.' (24 29; 21 91.) Again, 'What is it to eat Christ? It is not only to receive His 'body in the sacrament, for many unworthy receive,' &c. (24 31; 21 139.)

91. So far from its being quite certain, as these Romanists and Romanizers pretend, that when the outward part of the sacrament is received, the inward part must of necessity be received also, Bede adduces from his favourite author such proofs as were considered necessary to show that a person not only had received the sign, but also the reality of which it was the sign, and instructs us from the same source that in the absence of such proofs, however any might have received the visible symbols, it might be concluded with certainty they were not partakers of the things signified thereby. We shall here give the briefest extracts.

‘How, indeed, it may be eaten, and what is the way of eating this bread, &c. . . . Who then eateth not His flesh, nor drinketh His blood, hath not life in him, and who eateth His flesh, and drinketh His blood hath life. . . . But in this true meat and drink, that is, the body and blood of Christ . . . he that taketh it hath life, and that, of course, eternal.’ (24 29 ; 21 81.) ‘The sacrament of the unity of the body and blood of Christ is taken, by some to life, by some to destruction, but the reality of which it is the sacrament, is for every man to life, for none to destruction, whoever shall be a partaker thereof.’ (24 28 ; 21 82.) ‘This, then, it is, to eat that meat and drink that drink ; to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him. And, therefore, he who dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt neither spiritually eats His flesh nor drinks his blood, albeit carnally and visibly he presses with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ ; but rather doth unto judgment to himself eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing.’ (24 16, 28 ; 21 84.) ‘We then, live by Him, eating Him, that is, receiving Him as that eternal life which of ourselves we had not.’ (24 17, 29 ; 21 85.) ‘The sign which shows that one hath eaten and drunk is this, if he indwelleth, and is dwelt in, if he inhabiteth and is inhabited, if he cleaveth that he be not abandoned, . . . that we be in His body, under Himself the Head in His members, eating His flesh, not forsaking the unity of Him.’ (24 18, 29 ; 21 86.) ‘What the Lord hath given us to understand in the eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood, is, that we should dwell in Him and He in us. Now we dwell in Him, when we are His members, and He dwelleth in us when we are His temple.’ (24 20 ; 21 89.) ‘He promised unto us eternal life, and how He would have us understand who are they that eat His flesh and drink His blood, by this, namely, that they dwell in Him and He in them.’ (24 29 ; 21 90, 91.) ‘What is it to eat Christ? It is not only to receive His body in the sacrament. For many unworthy receive. . . . But how is Christ to be eaten? How, He Himself says. “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I

“in him.” If he abideth in me and I in him, then he eateth, then he drinketh. But he that abideth not in me, nor I in him, although he receive the sacrament, he getteth great torment. What then “he that abideth in me,” means, Himself says in another place: “He that keepeth my commandments, abideth in me and I in him.” (24 31; 21 139.)

92. Bede, in the seventh century, well represents the teaching of the early Fathers, and of Augustine in particular, respecting the nature of Christ’s presence with the Church since His ascension, which he maintains is in His divinity only, and that in His human nature, He will be absent until His second coming. This is a very different view from the one held by Paschasius and his followers. One of them of the present age, and bold in utterance, shall speak for himself and brethren,

‘Now, when we speak of Christ’s presence we do not mean the presence of His Deity, which being consubstantial with the Father can never be absent from any part of creation, and cannot be said either to go away or to return. We mean the presence of His person in its three constituent parts, Body, Soul, and Divinity, which are indivisible, and together make one Christ. Wherever He is present, He is present as God and as man; and in this sense are we to understand His own words, when He said, “I am with you always, even unto the end of the world”—with us, not in the power of His Godhead only, but in the perfection of His manhood also.’ (39 1.)

Compare with this rash, unfounded assertion, the sober scriptural statement of the venerable Bede, our ancient English doctor.

‘For, because He Himself is God and man, He was taken up into heaven, and sits by his humanity, which He had taken from the earth. He remains with the saints on earth by His Divinity, by which He equally fills heaven and earth.’ (24 2.) Again ‘He leaves the Church corporally, which, however, He never leaves destitute of the assistance of His Divine presence, remaining in it “always even unto the end of the world.” For the place of the flesh is properly the earth, which was taken, as it were, on a journey, when, by our Redeemer, it was placed in heaven.’ (24 3.) Once more, ‘What is that which He said to His disciples, when ascending into heaven? “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” He who then was in the world by His corporal presence is now everywhere in the world by His Divine presence.’ (24 21.)

93. Is it possible that our illustrious English doctor could have spoken thus if he had believed that when the Lord’s Supper is duly celebrated, there is the Real Presence of

Christ's body and blood, which, like His Divinity, can as well be present in a million places at the same instant of time as in one ?

94. From Bede's commentary on the words of institution in the Lord's Supper (24 4, 5) we come to the only consistent conclusion, viz., that this most illustrious divine of his age was an entire stranger to that doctrine which Archdeacon Denison flatters himself is catholic, apostolic, and primitive ; whereas, as tested by the teaching of Bede, it is uncatholic, apostatic, and private.

95. We must for the present take our leave of these three interesting witnesses—Bertram, Rabanus Maurus, and Bede, though we have only done justice in part to their important testimony. We beg the reader to digest for himself what is fully given in the Catena, and we are sure that he will know what estimate to form of Paschasius in the ninth century and of his present followers in the nineteenth.

CHAPTER IX.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE LEADING FATHERS OF THE FIRST 450 YEARS OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA CONCERNING THE SUPPOSED REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS. THE WORDS 'REAL PRESENCE,' OR 'PRESENCE,' IN REGARD TO THE EUCHARIST, SHOWN TO BE RATHER OF POST-REFORMATION ORIGIN THAN PATRISTIC. DR PUSEY'S FAITH STATED IN REGARD TO THE REAL PRESENCE AND THE PRESENCE NOT REAL. A FULL CONSIDERATION OF THE WORD 'MYSTERY' AND THE EQUIVALENT WORD 'SACRAMENT.' THE WORD MYSTERY SHOWN TO BE EMPLOYED BY THE FATHERS IN RELATION TO THE RITES OF BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER, IN THE SAME SENSE AS IT IS EMPLOYED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND ITS COGNATES IN THE SAME SENSE AS THEY ARE USED BY THE HEATHEN, WHICH USAGE IS SHOWN TO BE INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS. THE MISAPPLICATION OF THE WORD 'MYSTERIOUS' AND THE WORD 'MYSTERY,' UNDERSTOOD IN THAT SENSE, SHOWN TO BE MISAPPLIED TO THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS, AND THE ERROR CORRECTED OF BISHOP BROWNE MAKING IT APPEAR THAT CALVIN AND HOOKER FAVOURED SUCH A MISAPPLICATION. DR PUSEY'S USE AND ABUSE OF SUCH WORDS AS 'SPIRITUAL PRESENCE' AND 'PRESENT SPIRITUALLY' CONSIDERED AND ANSWERED, AND THE USE OF SUCH WORDS IN RELATION TO CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST SHOWN TO BE OF POST-REFORMATION ORIGIN, AND SELDOM, IF EVER, SO USED BY THE FATHERS. THE MARCIONITE NOTION OF DR PUSEY IN REGARD TO CHRIST'S HAVING AT HIS BIRTH AND RESURRECTION A SPIRITUAL BODY EXAMINED AND REFUTED FROM THE FATHERS TO WHOM HE APPEALS. THE MISTAKE POINTED OUT OF ARCHDEACON FREEMAN IN CONCLUDING ON INSUFFICIENT GROUNDS THAT BERTRAM AND PASCHASIUS RADBERT WERE OF ONE MIND IN REGARD TO THE DOCTRINE ON THE LORD'S SUPPER. THE DOCTRINE OF MR BENNETT ON THE LORD'S SUPPER PROVED TO BE LIKE THAT OF PASCHASIUS AND NOT LIKE THAT OF BERTRAM AND RADBERT, AS SIR ROBERT PHILLIMORE ASSIDUOUSLY ENDEAVOURS TO PROVE. THE DOCTRINE OF DR PUSEY AND MR SHIPLEY IN REGARD TO THE SPIRITUAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS STATED AND CONTRASTED WITH THE DOCTRINE OF THE FATHERS WHO SPEAK VERY EXPRESSLY OF CHRIST'S REAL SPIRITUAL PRESENCE IN REGARD TO HIS DIVINITY, AND IN THE SAME CONNECTION OF THE REAL BODILY ABSENCE OF HIS HUMANITY UNTIL HE COMES A SECOND TIME. THE PHRASE OF AMBROSE, 'THE BODY OF CHRIST IS A BODY OF A DIVINE SPIRIT,' AS INTERPRETED BY THE CONTEXT AND BY BERTRAM, SHOWN TO AFFORD NO REAL HELP TO DR PUSEY'S DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S BODY BEING PRESENT IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS AFTER THE MANNER OF A SPIRIT. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE FATHERS USE THE WORDS 'SPIRITUAL' AND 'SPIRITUALLY' SHOWN TO BE FATAL TO SUCH A DOCTRINE. THE STATEMENTS OF THE FATHERS GIVEN

IN WHICH THEY AFFIRM THAT THE WICKED RECEIVE ONLY THE SACRAMENT OF CHRIST'S BODY, THE SIGN OR SYMBOL ONLY, BUT NOT THE REALITY, WHICH IS SUBVERSIVE OF THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS. DR PUSEY'S NOVEL INVENTION OF A THIRD PART IN THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, NAMELY, GRACE IN ADDITION TO SIGN AND THINGS SIGNIFIED SHOWN NOT TO BE CORRECTLY FOUNDED ON THE CHURCH CATECHISM, NOR ON THE TEACHING OF AUGUSTINE, OR OF THE FATHERS GENERALLY, INASMUCH AS THEY MAINTAIN THAT THE THINGS SIGNIFIED CANNOT BE RECEIVED WITHOUT THE GRACE OR VIRTUE, NOR THE GRACE OR VIRTUE WITHOUT THE THING SIGNIFIED. THE CITATIONS MADE BY DR PUSEY FROM AUGUSTINE TO PROVE THAT THE WICKED IN RECEIVING THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS DO ALSO REALLY RECEIVE IN THEM CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD, ILLUSTRATED BY AUGUSTINE'S OWN PLAIN TEACHING, AND PROVED TO TEACH NO SUCH DOCTRINE. SOME OF THE REASONS STATED WHY ROMANISTS APPEAL TO THE GENERAL TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS IN FAVOUR OF THEIR DOCTRINES, WITH AN EXAMINATION AND EXPOSURE OF THE ABORTIVE ATTEMPT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLICS IN THE CORPUS JURIS CANONICI TO RECONCILE THE PLAIN TEACHING OF AUGUSTINE WITH THAT OF PASCHASIUS AND HIS DISCIPLES ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1. We have as yet only investigated the border-land of patristic evidence and have now to explore its entire region. Dr Pusey professes to have done so, and records for his own satisfaction, 'that the Fathers did receive unhesitatingly in 'their literal sense our blessed Lord's words, "This is my "body."'"—(*Doctrine of the Real Presence, Notes, &c.*, p. 720). Thus he says, 'From Syria, and Palestine, and Armenia; from 'Asia Minor and Greece; from Thrace and Italy; from Gaul 'and Spain; from Africa Proper, and Egypt, and Arabia, and 'the Isles of the Sea; wherever any apostle had taught; 'wherever any martyr had sealed with his blood the testimony 'of Jesus; from the polished cities, or the anchorites of the 'desert, one Eucharistic voice ascended, "Righteous art thou, "O Lord, and all thy words are truth." Thou hast said, "'This is my body," "This is my blood." Hast Thou said, 'and shalt not Thou do it? As Thou hast said, so we believe.' —(*Ibid.*, pp. 721, 722).

2. Dr Pusey thus assumes that the whole range of patristic evidence is entirely on his side; that the doctrine on the Eucharist, as held by himself and his brethren, rests upon the broad basis of having been believed everywhere, always, and by all. We maintain that it was absolutely unknown until

the ninth century. We have now to examine more especially some of the leading witnesses of those whom he has adduced, as well as others whom he has omitted. Their names and shortest history here follow.

3. CLEMENT of Rome, HERMAS, POLYCARP, BARNABAS, and the unknown author of the Epistle to Diognetus, are commonly called apostolical. These have made no direct reference to the Lord's Supper, and have not been adduced by Dr Pusey; their silence was of no avail to him, but is most important to us. IGNATIUS, also called apostolical, including the epistles which have come down to us under his name. JUSTIN MARTYR, the valuable apologist who wrote in Greek to defend his fellow-Christians against persecuting heathens and bigotted Jews. IRENEUS, who wrote against the wide-spread Gnostic heresy, whose original writings in Greek exist only in part, and for the remainder we are indebted to a Latin version. CLEMENT and ORIGEN, two most famous Greek authors, who successively filled the catechetical chair of Alexandria. Of these, Origen is by far the more important witness, and is one of the three whose writings we shall more especially examine, not omitting a single extract cited from him by Dr Pusey. TERTULLIAN, a sable African presbyter, who, like Justin Martyr, with great courage and ability wrote in defence of his Christian brethren, and is by far the most important author of the early Latin Church. CYPRIAN, a Latin Bishop of Carthage, who called Tertullian master, and was the leading ecclesiastic of his day, whose testimony is so important with Dr Pusey that he for the most part accepts it as inspired. LACTANTIUS, who wrote in Latin in Ciceronian style, and was the Iconoclast and anti-superstitionist of his day, is greatly out of favour with modern Romanists, and is neglected by Dr Pusey. EUSEBIUS, Bishop of Cæsarea, a Greek author, and the chief ancient Church historian. CYRIL, Bishop of Jerusalem, famous for his catechetical lectures. BASIL, surnamed the Great, a Greek Bishop of Cæsarea, eloquent as well as profound, is one of the most important and valuable of our witnesses. AMBROSE, noble and famous, and the spiritual father of the great Augustine. JEROME of Rome and of Bethlehem, the most learned man of all the early Latin Church, and its greatest Biblical scholar,

who left to it a version of the Holy Scriptures made by himself which eclipsed all preceding ones, and still remains substantially the authentic version of the Roman Church. This witness is the second of the three whom we have chosen as acknowledged to be the most famous for sacred learning and knowledge in the several ages in which they lived. All that Dr Pusey has chosen to quote from this most famous Biblical scholar will be found in our *Catena Patrum*. GAUDENTIUS, a Latin Bishop of Breseia, a witness of no particular mark, would not have been cited by us but for the circumstance of Dr Pusey's so garbling his testimony as to make him into a false witness. RUFFINUS, a Latin Presbyter of Aquelia, next to Jerome, the most learned man of his age, who, like Clement of Rome and Lactantius, uses no such figures of speech in relation to the Lord's Supper as to suit Romanists and Romanizers, is passed over by Dr Pusey, and his hundred witnesses are exclusive of him—Clement, Hermas, Polycarp, Barnabas, and Lactantius. AUGUSTINE, a Latin Bishop of a village or small town in Africa, called Hippo, is universally acknowledged to have been the most famous divine of the Church during the first four hundred years, and has said so much on the nature and use of sacramental language, and of the various topics connected with this discussion, that he may be considered the most important witness which we have. CHRYSOSTOM, a Greek, sometime Presbyter at Antioch, and finally Archbishop of Constantinople, is the most rhetorical of all the fathers, who cited when on rhetorical wing might be made to appear to have anticipated the heresy of Paschasius and his followers, but when cited on *terra firma* is one of our most valuable witnesses. THEODORET, Bishop of Cyprus, a Greek commentator and Church historian, is our last witness of those who have been cited by Dr Pusey, but by no means the least, for he is generally admitted to be the greatest and most able interpreter of the Holy Scripture during the century in which he lived. All that Dr Pusey has cited from this author in his list of witnesses we have included in ours.

4. Dr Pusey has cited about four hundred pages of extracts from some of these and other witnesses, which he entitles 'Testimony to the belief in the Real Presence in the early Church;'

and this most doubtful statement is inflicted on the reader more than two hundred times. Now, it is most certain that the Latin Fathers generally, and Augustine in particular, were very precise in avowing their belief only *in* the Persons of the Holy Trinity, and regarded a belief *in* other persons and things as sinful (see sec. 123 below). The phrase is objectionable on other grounds; for the words 'real presence,' in relation to the consecrated elements, is of modern use, and for the most part has arisen out of the heresy of Paschasius. Out of the numerous extracts from the early Fathers made by Dr Pusey, the phrase 'real presence,' or the word 'presence,' does not appear to occur. In his sermon he represents Chrysostom as saying, 'Christ is really present because the sacrament is His body' (28 47). This would seem to be very much like a real presence in the consecrated elements; but such a notion is entirely dissipated when Chrysostom is fully and fairly quoted. He, in his homily on the Seraphim, says, 'When then thou art about to approach the Holy Table, think that there the King of all is present: for He is present indeed, observing the mind of all, and seeth who approacheth with befitting holiness, and who with an evil conscience, with unclean and foul thoughts and wicked deeds' (*Hom. in Seraph. tom. iii., p. 893*). Chrysostom here, most certainly, is speaking of Christ's presence in His Divinity, and not in His humanity. It is truly outrageous to deduce from such a statement the real presence of Christ's body in the consecrated elements. Hooker has well expressed Chrysostom's doctrine on the presence where he says, 'The real Presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament' (*Eccle. Pol. Bk. v., 67*). So far from Chrysostom saying that the sacrament or mystery is Christ's body, he states, 'With each one of the faithful doth He mingle Himself in the mysteries' (22 9).

5. The word 'presence,' in relation to Christ in the Eucharist, is rarely used in the sacramental phraseology of the Fathers; and when it is used it relates to Christ's Divinity, and not His humanity. Augustine uses the phrase 'spiritual presence' in relation to Christ, but so as to imply His bodily

absence. He states, 'Christ left the world by corporeal departure. He went His way unto the Father by the ascension of the manhood, yet quitted not the world by the governance of His presence. . . . Christ shall come once in bodily presence . . . by spiritual presence He was, we know, to be with them after His ascension, and with His whole Church in this world, "even unto the end of the "world" . . . whom He was about to leave by bodily absence that he might keep by spiritual presence' (21 102).

Again he says,

'If thou art a good man thou belongest to the body which Peter denotes [meaning the true Church of Christ]; thou hast Christ both in the present and in the future: in the present by faith, in the present by the sign, in the present by the sacrament of Baptism, in the present by the meat and drink of the altar. . . . He was speaking of His bodily presence. For in respect of His Majesty, in respect of His Providence, in respect of the ineffable and invisible grace, that is in fulfilling that which was spoken by Him, "Lo, I am with you "always, even unto the end of the world." But in respect of the flesh which the Word assumed, &c., ye will not have Him always with you. Why? Because He conversed in respect of His bodily presence forty days with His disciples, and by them attended homeward, their eyes following, not themselves, ascended into heaven, and is not here. For He is there: He sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and yet is here, for the presence of His Majesty hath not quitted us' (21 97. See also secs. 4, 51, 96, 119).

6. Herein subsequent Fathers, and our Reformers, followed Augustine and commonly spoke of Christ's Spiritual presence with the faithful, but especially in the Lord's Supper. Alcuin, a worthy disciple of Bede, did so (sec. 72 below), and so did Zwingle, Calvin, Cranmer, and Jewel (secs. 38-41 below).

7. We shall now give Dr Pusey's doctrine of the Real Presence as fully stated by himself. 'I believe that in the Holy Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ are sacramentally, supernaturally, ineffably, but verily and indeed, present "under "the form of bread and wine," and that "where His body is, "there is Christ."' (35 61.) Since he gave his challenge, of which the above is a part, he has added some more defining words, and said 'the same body which is locally at the Right Hand of God, is supralocally, under a different mode of existence, present with us really, truly, substantially, though spiritually. And since His body is there, there must His

'soul be also, there also His Divinity.' (35 68.) In addition to this numerous list of adverbs he has called into requisition several adjectives which express his belief in another form. He says, 'the presence of which our Lord speaks has been 'termed sacramental, supernatural, mystical, ineffable.' (35 10.) These definitions he fully accepts. Dr Pusey's faith then in regard to the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, defined in its fullest form, is, 'I believe that in the holy Eucharist the body and blood of Christ are sacramentally, mystically, spiritually, supernaturally, ineffably, supralocally, substantially, really, truly, and indeed "present, "under the form of bread and wine." The presence "of Christ "under the form of bread and wine" is sacramental, mystical, supernatural, and ineffable.' This is just half of Dr Pusey's faith in regard to the consecrated elements, though in his estimation it is by far the most important half.

8. The other half which we shall now state, relates to the figurative or symbolical presence, if presence it can be called, in contradistinction to which the other presence just noticed, supposed not to be figurative, has been called real. He states, 'It is true that the outward elements are figures, types, symbols, images of His body.' (35 12.) Again he states, 'S. Basil, S. Gregory Nazianzum, S. Macarius, Eusebius, Theodoret, Eustathius, S. Augustine, say, as did Tertullian, that the consecrated elements are symbols, types, antitypes, figures, images, of the Lord's body and blood.' (35 20.)

9. Mr Shipley has expressed still more clearly the point which we wish to be well understood by the reader. He says, 'In the Eucharist the union of the bread and wine with the Body and Blood of Christ, each remaining in its own nature, constitutes the sacrament; and when we speak of receiving the sacrament, we mean, or ought to mean, receiving both or whole Christ "under the form of bread and wine." The distinction between the sacrament and the substance or reality of it, is of consequence, as serving to account for the use of certain terms, which might be perplexing without it. The [consecrated] bread and wine are sometimes called the symbols, figures, types, or antitypes of the Body and Blood; whence it might be inferred that the presence of Christ is only sym-

'bolical, figurative, and not real. But these terms are applied 'to the outward part as a sign or figure, not of a thing which 'is necessarily absent, but of that which is inward and unseen.' (39 6, 7—see also 38 15).

10. It should be noticed that Dr Pusey, Mr Shipley, and Dr Hamilton, who appear to speak with much complacency and satisfaction of a sacrament having two parts, an outward and an inward, and of its including both sign and thing signified, are employing Protestant nomenclature which has no existence in the writings of the Fathers, and which as a definition of the word sacrament, was unknown to them. The definition which seems to suit their purpose so admirably is actually a Zwinglian one (See ch. x. 21-23.)

11. Of one of the sacraments of the church in the wilderness Augustine thus speaks, 'For he did not say "the Rock "signified Christ," but as it were, was this very thing, though 'it was not this in substance but in signification.' (21 23.) Dr Pusey and Mr Shipley however maintain that when Christ said 'This is my body,' He meant to say that it was His body not merely in signification but in substance also, the bread was not only the figure of His body but the reality too. What is seen of the bread is considered to be the outward part which signifies or represents that which is not seen but which is believed (to use their favourite phrase in their own sense) to be 'under the form of bread,' is the inward part, that is the reality. If a man is represented by an image or picture he cannot really be in the image or picture—the two things are absolutely incompatible.

12. Now Dr Pusey and his school, in order to bring the sacramental terms in common use by the Fathers into harmony with the new doctrine of the real presence, are obliged like their father Paschasius to give a new interpretation to such words and phrases as 'sacrament,' 'mystery,' 'in a sacrament,' or 'sacramentally,' 'in a mystery,' or 'mystically.' Thus the maintainers of this new doctrine consider a sacrament, that is bread duly consecrated, not only to be a sacred sign of Christ's body, but itself also to be Christ's body, and if the body of Christ is said to be in the sacrament or to be present sacramentally, they understand it to be really in the sacrament, or

to be really and actually present. It will now be shown that the way in which the Fathers employ these words and sometimes interpret them is quite fatal to the modern doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the unconsecrated elements.

13. Paschasius, as we have seen, maintained that the word sacrament, in relation to the Lord's Supper, not only included the sacramental elements, but in or with them the real body and blood of Christ. (33 6, 7, 19, 24.) And this is the doctrine of all his followers, Dr. Pusey not excepted. With both Romanists and Romanizers the phrase 'Sacrament of the body of Christ' is understood to mean the real body of Christ either subsisting in or with the elements of bread, not external to it, or the substance of the bread having ceased to exist, there is only the substance of Christ's real body. Now it is certain that the ancients did not so understand the word sacrament or mystery in relation to the Lord's Supper, or any other rite, which can be fully shown from the following phrases, selected from our Catena in the order in which they stand.

14. Tertullian speaks of 'the sacrament of the bread and the cup.' (10, 15.) Cyprian uses the same style as his master, and speaks of 'the sacrament of the cup.' (12, 6.) Jerome says of Christ, 'He delivered the mystery of His body and blood.' (18 31.) Again, 'No one can understand the sacraments of the passion of the Lord, and of His body and blood.' (18 34.) Gaudentius speaks of 'the mystery of bread and wine.' (19 3.) Again he remarks, 'For what we have above explained generally, as to eating the flesh of the lamb, we must observe, especially in tasting, these same mysteries of the Lord's passion.' (19 8.) Again, 'Those mysteries of eternal life.' (19 11.) Further, 'He appointed the sacraments of His body and blood to be offered in the form of bread and wine.' (19 12.)

15. Augustine states, 'After a certain manner the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ Therefore the sacrament of so great a thing, he called by no other name than that of the thing itself.' (21 3.) 'The sacrament of which reality.' (21 30.) 'The sacrament of

‘this thing, that is, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, But the thing itself of which it is the sacrament.’ (21 82.) ‘He press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ the sacrament of so great a thing.’ (21 84.) ‘The oil of our fire is the sacrament of the Holy Spirit.’ (21 126.) ‘The mystery of yourselves is placed upon the Lord’s table; ye receive the mystery of yourselves.’ (21 136). Chrysostom states, ‘If therefore it was dangerous to transfer to private uses those holy vessels in which there is not the true body of Christ, but the mystery of his body is contained, how much more the vessels of our body, which God has prepared for a habitation to Himself.’ (22 11.)

16. Bede says, ‘For the flesh and blood of the lamb, substituting a sacrament of His flesh and blood in the figure of bread and wine.’ (24 4.) Bertram, after having given the sentiments of Augustine, remarks, ‘We see St Augustine saith, that the sacraments are one thing, and the things of which they are the sacraments another.’ (25 21.) Again, ‘The sacraments of these things have assumed the names of the things themselves, so as to be called the body and blood of Christ.’ (25 22.)

17. The reader has only to consider with a little attention these citations, and he will see how utterly impossible it would be for these Fathers to use such language, had they in any degree conceived of the word sacrament or mystery in the manner Paschasius did, and as his disciples now do, viz., not only that the element is the sign, but that it contains in or under it the thing signified also.

18. It is most probable that the word mystery in the sense in which it occurs in some parts of the New Testament was employed by the early fathers as a most suitable term to express what was symbolical in the Eucharist; and if so, the sense which it bears in the New Testament would probably be the sense it was intended to mean as employed in the Eucharist; any how we could not well conceive of holy men who had so profound a regard for Holy Scripture, using the word mystery in the Lord’s Supper in a sense absolutely different from what it bears in Scripture. It is probable that the word mystery, and what was understood to be its exact

equivalent, sacrament, were not applied to the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper until the second century. Some of our modern Protestant friends, perhaps with more zeal than discretion, have condemned their use and application in that connection as unscriptural and incorrect. It is a fact, however, that in Scripture the word *mystery* is used precisely in the same sense in some passages as that in which we are prepared to prove the Fathers use it in relation to Baptism and the Eucharist. We read, 'The *mystery* [most 'ancient Latin version *sacrament*] of the seven stars' (Rev. i. 20.) 'The *mystery* (*sacrament*) of the woman' (Rev. xvii. 7.) 'This is a great *mystery* (*sacrament*) but I speak of 'Christ and His Church' (Eph. v. 32.) It is obvious that in this connection the word *mystery* and its equivalent sacrament are used as signs which have a hidden or secret meaning. Chrysostom, concerning the word *mystery* as it occurs in the last of the above texts, speaks of it as containing an allegory (xxii. 30.) In the three cases adduced, the term *mystery* is not really that which it represents or signifies. Is it conceivable that able and learned men, well acquainted with the nature and use of words, could use the same word in so obviously analogous a case in an exactly opposite sense? Verily, the mystery of Christ's Body and Blood, in the judgment of the early Fathers, was no more really His Body and Blood than the mystery of the woman was really corrupt Christian Rome, than the mystery of the seven stars was really the seven Churches, than the mystery of the marriage union is really Christ and His Church. The word *mystery* occurs twenty-seven times in the New Testament, and, as we shall shortly see, is derived from the original word *μυστήριον*, of which it is the uniform equivalent. It simply means a secret, and is always translated in the ancient Syriac version in that sense. Its meaning, then, is totally different from that commonly attributed to it at the present day, and does not denote anything incapable of being known, comprehended, or understood, but on the contrary is spoken of as a secret which can be 'made known,' 'revealed,' and 'shown.' (Dan ii. 19, 26-29.) In the New Testament the word is employed after the same manner (Matt. xiii. 35, Eph. iii. 3, 5, and vi. 19.)

19. But the Fathers, and especially the Greek Fathers, not only employed the word mystery as it occurs in the New Testament, but also it and all its cognates as they are employed by heathen writers. In relation to the superstitious observances of the heathen, we commonly find the word *μυσέω*, to initiate into mysteries, to instruct; *μυστήριον*, a secret, a religious mystery; *μυσταγωγέω*, to initiate into sacred mysteries; *μυσταγωγία*, initiation in sacred mysteries; *μύστης*, one initiated in sacred mysteries; *μυστάγωγος*, one who initiates others in sacred mysteries; *μυστικός*, mystical, sacred to the initiated; none of these Greek terms occurs either in the original of the New Testament, or in the canonical Greek Scriptures of the Old Testament, except *μυστήριον* (mystery or secret.) All these words are in common use with the Greek Fathers, and are often so employed by the Latin Fathers. Those then to whom these mysteries are made known, or are not made known, are said to be initiated or not initiated into mysteries. Chrysostom uses this kind of language (22 25), and so does Theodoret. (23 5, 15, 38.) Those who officiate in the Lord's Supper, and the things employed therein, or in connection therewith, are defined by some one of the cognates of the word mystery. Hence the wine is called mystical. Eusebius (14 4.) Theodoret (23 1.) The table is called mystical. Chrysostom (22 1.) Theodoret (23 7.) Sacramental words are called mystical words. Theodoret (23 12.) The time of celebration is called mystical. Theodoret (23 15.) The spiritual food given in the sacrament is called mystical food. Eusebius (14 4.) Theodoret (23 25.) The service of the Lord's Supper is called mystical. Theodoret (23 33.) The consecrated elements are called symbols, and these again are called mystical symbols. Theodoret (23 43.) The consecrated elements are called mysteries, 'mystery of bread and wine.' Gaudentius (19 3.) 'Mysteries of the Lord's passion' (19 8.) 'Participation of the mysteries.' Chrysostom (22 7.) 'Reminds us of the passion even by the mysteries.' (22 8.) 'Use water in the mysteries.' (22 9.) 'He partakes of the mysteries.' (22 29.) 'In the delivery of the mysteries,' 'who partake of the divine mysteries.' Theodoret (23 40.) 'About the divine mysteries.' (23 41) Lectures to the newly

baptized are called *μυσταγωγίαι*, that is, expositions of mysteries, introductions into the mysteries. (*Cyril Cat. Mys.* i. p. 284.) Origen calls St John a fellow-*mysta* of Christ. (11 26.)

20. Ritualists and High Anglicans greatly impose upon their unlearned readers by assuming that the word *mystery* and its cognates, when employed in connection with the Lord's Supper, have relation to what is inexplicable and above human comprehension. In conformity with this idea, Dr. Pusey has represented Eusebius as calling the sacramental food *mysterious*. (14 4.) But the same word, as used in the same connection by Theodoret, he has correctly translated *sacramental*. (23 15.) In the above citations the word *sacramental* would as well have given the correct idea to the reader as the word *mystical*, thus, the sacramental wine, sacramental table, sacramental words, sacramental time, sacramental food, sacramental service, sacramental symbols; the word *mysterious* would have been quite out of place; and when Dr. Pusey represents Eusebius as calling sacramental bread *mysterious* food (14 4), it is most probable his ill-instructed but too-confiding disciples in reading such a phrase would think only of the real body of Christ under the form of bread. Such words then as *mystery*, *mystical*, *mystically*, or their exact equivalents, *sacrament*, *sacramentally*, in relation to the Eucharist, if understood in their natural and obvious meaning, are subversive of the doctrine of the real presence as held by Dr. Pusey and all Paschasians. Paschasius, as we have seen, added new meanings to them, and herein he has been closely followed by his disciples, Dr. Pusey not excepted. Thus, he says, 'The presence of which our Lord speaks has been termed *sacramental*, *mystical*.' (35 10.) 'Where the consecrated bread is, there, *sacramentally*, is the body of Christ; where the consecrated wine is, there, *sacramentally*, is the blood of Christ.' (35 49.) 'I believe that in the Holy Eucharist the body and blood of Christ are *sacramentally* present.' (35 61.) 'The same body which was broken for us, and the blood which was shed for us, therein *sacramentally* present.' (35 62.)

21. This is neither more nor less than the language of the Reformers, who repudiated, with abhorrence, Dr. Pusey's carnal notion of receiving by the mouth Christ's real body and blood

in the elements. Thus Zwingli says, "This is my body" is 'not to be understood naturally and in the proper sense of the words, but symbolically, denominatively, metonymically, in this manner, this is my *sacramental* or *mystical* body, that is, symbolical, *sacramental*, and vicarious of that body which 'was truly assumed, died, and suffered.' (29 22; see also secs. 5, 16, and 20.) Dr. Pusey may be justly charged with attaching a private and comparatively modern meaning to the words which we have italicized in the above extracts. Such terms are rather suggestive of a real absence than of a real presence. If Christ is present in sign, in sacrament, or in mystery, or significantly, sacramentally, or mystically, He is not really present. If he is really present in the consecrated elements, they have ceased to be signs, sacraments, or mysteries, and Christ is not present in them by signification, sacramentally, or mystically, but truly and substantially.

22. The Fathers did not invent the word mystery and its cognates, but took them as already invented by the ancient heathens, and used them as they used them. No one ever pretended that the mysteries of the heathens were not only signs and symbols, but also the very things of which they were the signs and symbols. The Fathers, as we should expect, employed these words in their proper and accepted sense, which is singularly opposed to the meaning which when it suits their convenience, Romanists and Romanizers would fix upon them. Perhaps nothing more has served to uphold the doctrine of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements than the use its advocates have made of such words as mystery, mysterious, mystic, mystically. These, more than any other, terms have tended to mislead the unlearned reader. The word 'mysteries,' in relation to the Lord's Supper, had reference to the bread and wine, and often was another name for signs or symbols; and the only sense in which the word could be applied to them, would be descriptive of what was secret to the eye and to our ordinary senses, those objects for instance which the symbols symbolized; but those objects were apprehensible to the initiated, and more especially to the spiritually-minded. In this sense Chrysostom understood the term in relation to the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

After interpreting the word mystery according to its ordinary meaning in Scripture, he shows in what sense it is used in relation to the sacraments. He says, 'In another sense a mystery is so called, because we believe, not the very things which we see, but some things we see and others we believe. For such is the nature of our mysteries. For instance, I feel differently upon these subjects from an unbeliever, &c. For not by sight do I judge of the things that appear, but by the eyes of the mind, I hear of the "Body of Christ," in another sense the unbeliever.' (22 17.)

23. In the third, fourth, and fifth centuries the Christian Church commonly concealed their mysteries from the uninitiated after the manner of the heathen ; but before this time it does not appear that any of the Fathers, in the profession of their faith, concealed their mysteries, sacraments, or religious rites from the unbaptized. Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Irenæus did not. Justin, who lived about the year of our Lord 140, did not scruple, in the defence of his fellow-Christians, to sketch out a description of the administration of Baptism and of the celebration of the Lord's Supper for the use of the heathens. (7 1, 2.) After this time, in the days of Tertullian, and early in the third century, all the Christian rites were kept secret. He says—' Since the fidelity of secrecy is, by the very rule of all mysteries, due to them. The Samothracian and Eleusinian are kept secret ; how much more such as, being divulged, will, in the meantime, provoke even the vengeance of man, while that of God is kept in store ! And whence have strangers the knowledge, when even holy mysteries ever exclude the profane ' (*Apol. c. 7, p. 25*). Deprecating those Christians who used no secrecy in the administration of their rites, he says—' It is doubtful who is a catechumen, who a believer ; they have all access alike, they hear alike, they pray alike. Even if heathens come in upon them they will "cast that which is holy unto dogs, and pearls," false though they be, "before swine" ' (*De Præ. Adv. Hær., c. 41, p. 213*).

24. How the Fathers generally speak of keeping secret their rites in connection with Baptism and the Lord's Supper may be seen by consulting the following references :—Cyril,

15 1, 2, 3, 4; Basil, 16 7; Jerome, 18 23; Gaudentius, 19 2; Augustine, 21 60; Chrysostom, 22 16, 25; and Theodoret, 23 5, 38, 44. Looking at the sacraments from a Protestant point of view, it might well be asked—Seeing that the Scriptures were not kept secret, and that then, as now, they contained all that was required to be known respecting the Lord's Supper, to which, no doubt, the unbaptized had access; in what way, then, could there be anything in the Lord's Supper more secret to the unbaptized than to the baptized? To this the answer is, that the word *mysteries*, or *secrets*, is not so often applied by the Fathers to what is revealed respecting the Lord's Supper in the New Testament, as to numerous rites and ceremonies which they admit are not revealed therein, but known only by private tradition. The testimony of Basil is very express upon this point:—

‘Who has taught in writing to sign with the sign of the cross those who have placed their hope in Christ? What writing hath taught us to pray turned to the East? Who of the saints has left to us the words of invocation when the bread of the Eucharist is consecrated and the cup of blessing? For we are not satisfied with those words in which the Apostle or Gospel made the remembrance, but we say other words both before and after, as it were to add force to the mystery which we have received by tradition beyond what was written. From what writings do we consecrate the water of Baptism, and the anointing oil, and him who has received Baptism? Is it not from silent and secret tradition? Moreover, what discourse in writing has taught the anointing itself? Whence is it that a man is baptized thrice? From what writings do we derive whatever other things relate to Baptism, such as the renouncing of Satan and his angels? Is it not this unpublished and secret tradition which our fathers observed with entire silence? For which things it is not lawful for the uninitiated to look upon; how was it suitable that the doctrine of these things should be brought forth publicly in writing?’ (16 7).

25. The Fathers in their discourses delivered in the presence of the uninitiated or unbaptized, avoided the use of the words *bread and wine* in relation to the Lord's Supper, while they freely spoke in that connection of *Christ's Body and Blood*; thus, Theodoret describes the bread as food that is made of a certain grain, the wine by a common name that signifies a kind of drink. (23 44.) Augustine says—‘This bread the altar of God doth signify,’ meaning, of course, that the sacra-

mental bread signified Christ the Bread of Life. (21 77.) So anxious were the Fathers to conceal the use of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper from the uninitiated that, notwithstanding their profound reverence for the Word of God, they sometimes designedly misquoted it. Thus the words, 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup' (1 Cor. xi. 28). Jerome cites as follows, 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him approach the body and blood of the Lord.' (18 32). Again, the words, 'Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord' (1 Cor. xi. 27). Augustine cites thus—'Whosoever eateth the body of Christ, &c.' Respecting the former, Dr Pusey remarks—'S. Jerome so identifies "the bread and the cup" with the body and blood of Christ, as even to substitute the words, "body and blood," when quoting the Apostle' (Notes, &c., p. 479). Of the latter he observes, 'Nay, so persuaded was S. Augustine, that the wicked do eat the body and blood of Christ, that he quotes S. Paul's words in the way of paraphrase, "Whoso eateth the body of Christ." '—*The Real Presence, the Doctrine, &c.*, pp. 265, 266.

26. Here Dr Pusey very adroitly turns to his own account this misquoting of Scripture by Jerome and Augustine as a proof of their belief of his own peculiar doctrines, whereas, in truth, their misquotation, if done designedly, was to avoid the use of the words bread and wine before the uninitiated. In thus quoting these passages they did not really misquote the sense, for it is common in Holy Scripture to call the signs by the names of the things which they signify—a principle generally held by the Fathers, and elaborately explained and illustrated by Augustine. To suppose, as Dr Pusey appears to do, that these holy men changed the language of Scripture to favour the doctrine of the Real Presence is outrageous in the extreme. It has yet to be proved that the doctrine in question had then any existence, and even if it had, we are certain that then there was no controversy respecting it, and therefore no inducement for these devout and conscientious men to misquote Scripture in its defence, even supposing they were capable of it. The Fathers, and especially Augustine, in their

exposition of metaphorical or figurative language, never include the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, excepting inferentially; that as the manna and the rock in the wilderness were not that of which they were the signs, so no more were the consecrated bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. One could have wished that Augustine had included with the other metaphors which he explains, the consecrated elements, but there were special reasons, as we have seen, for his not doing so. But in the tenth century, when such concealment of the mysteries from the unbaptised had ceased, and Dr Pusey's doctrine of the Real Presence was invented, and by some zealous converts to the new views, was defended, Ælfrie, Archbishop of Canterbury or York, reproducing a portion of Augustine's explanation of metaphorical words, which he shows, if taken by any one in their proper literal signification, would be blasphemy, added thereto the consecrated bread of the Lord's Supper. Thus he says, 'Some things be spoken of 'Christ by signification, and some be things certain. True 'this is and certain, that Christ was born of a maid, and suffered death of His own accord, and was buried. He is said 'to be bread by signification, and a lamb, and a lion, and a 'mountain. He is called bread because He is our life and 'angels' life. He is said to be a lamb for His innocency, and 'a lion for strength wherewith He overcame the devil. But 'Christ is not so, notwithstanding, after true nature; neither 'bread, nor a lamb, nor a lion. Why is then the holy housel '[sacrament] called Christ's body, or His blood, if it be not 'truly what is called? Truly the bread and the wine in the 'Supper by the priest are hallowed; show one thing without 'to human understanding, and another thing within to believing minds.' (27 3-5). This is all the more significant and telling from the circumstance that Ælfrie associates bread and wine with other metaphorical words which Augustine had explained as such, with a view to confute the doctrine of Paschasius and others who at that time had begun to maintain that the consecrated bread of the Eucharist was the same body of Christ which was born of Mary, suffered and was buried, and not that by signification only.

27. Romanists, Romanizers, and High Anglicans assume

that there is the most profound mystery respecting the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, and they make the assumption all the more delusive by inflating their discourses with a few such phrases as 'these ineffable mysteries,' 'these awful mysteries,' 'these most tremendous mysteries,' &c., cited from one or two of the rhetorical Fathers. Chrysostom, the chief of the few Fathers who use these epithets, nowhere employs them to describe an inscrutable mystery as to how bread can remain bread and wine remain wine, and yet at the same time be the real body and blood of Christ. To him there was no more mystery, in the modern sense of the term, in the Lord's Supper, than there is in the marriage union, although this is called by the Apostle 'a great mystery.' But here we have no great mystery in the modern sense of the term. Dean Alford well expresses the generally received interpretation of the passage as follows:—'Meaning the matter 'mystically alluded to in the Apostle's application of the text 'just quoted; the mystery of the spiritual union of Christ 'with our humanity typified by the close conjunction of the 'marriage state i.e., my meaning, in citing the above 'text, is to call your attention not to mere human marriage but 'to that high and mysterious relation between Christ and His 'Church, of which that other is but a faint resemblance.' After this manner Chrysostom himself understood the text. (22 30). The mystery or secret is the marvellous union of the Church or body of true believers with Christ, and so Augustine understood it. (21 116). But this is just how Chrysostom and the Fathers generally understood the word mystery in the Lord's Supper, not as an inscrutable mystery, but as a revealed secret to the initiated, yet so sublime as to attract the wonder of angels. Chrysostom, however, states, 'It is 'necessary for us to understand the marvel of the mysterious' (22 13), and this he goes on to explain as being our mystical union and incorporation with Christ. These holy men realised their union with Christ, it being made present to their minds by faith, and out of the fulness of their heart they expressed, as was natural, that most wonderful union in impressive terms.

28. Beyond all question the phrases, 'the mystery of the 'seven stars,' &c., and 'the mystery of the woman,' &c., are

figurative forms of speech, and the Fathers plainly teach, and Dr Pusey admits that they teach, that the mysteries or sacraments in the Lord's Supper are figures, types, antitypes, symbols, signs, images, &c., of that which they represent. But Archdeacon Denison, in his 'Defence,' informs us that 'to assign a *figurative* character to the words of Institution, of the same kind with that truly assigned to other passages of Holy Scripture in which our blessed Lord is spoken of under figures, is to explain away the MYSTERY of the Real Presence.' (36 3.) Here the Archdeacon either ignorantly, or less innocently, imposes on his readers by attaching a meaning to the word 'mystery' altogether different from that which was attached to it by those who first applied the word to a part of the Lord's Supper. Assigning a figurative meaning, as everybody does, to the texts already alluded to in the Revelation, does not make it appear that the word 'mystery' is incorrectly applied to them, because we can be sure it is not. But the early Greek Fathers, as we have seen, apply the word 'mystery' in the same sense to the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, from which we should rather infer that they assigned a figurative character rather than a literal one to the words of institution, the word 'mystery,' as they understood it, being more consonant with the former than the latter view. It has always been the practice of introducers of heresy to attach new and private meanings to theological words; but for this practice Dr Pusey and the Archdeacon would not have had the semblance of proof for their novelties. As we have seen, the ancient Latin versions, used the word 'sacrament' in the texts in question as equivalent to the word 'mystery,' and as the Greek Fathers applied the word 'mysteries' to the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, so did the Latin Fathers apply the word 'sacraments' in exactly the same sense. The Archdeacon might just as well have stated what he intended for an argument as follows:—'To assign a *figurative* character to the words of institution, &c., is to explain away the SACRAMENT of the Real Presence.' Had he argued thus:—'To assign a *literal* character to the words of institution, &c., is to explain away the MYSTERY or SACRAMENT of the Real Presence'—that is, the signs or symbols of the Reality signi-

fied, he would have argued correctly, and in fact would have reproduced the very argument of Bertram (25 57), and would have been in sweet accord with the Holy Catholic Church and all those whom Dr Pusey strangely calls Calvinists, however contrary he might have been to comparatively modern Romano-Græco-Anglo-Catholics.

29. It should be noticed that the Ritualist leaders would persuade their unlearned readers, and those who are so unfortunate as to accept them as their teachers, that the Fathers apply the strong epithets we noticed a little above to the altar and to the consecrated elements, and to what they supposed was contained in or under them, as if their wonder, worship, and thoughts were concentrated on a few feet square of stone or timber, as to a throne on which were supposed to lie whole Christ Jehovah and man. Mr Shipley gives a fair specimen of the teaching of his school in relation to this point. He says, 'Every term which could indicate its superhuman character, or express the prostration of the human spirit before its greatness, was applied to it. "The tremendous and unbloody sacrifice," "the heavenly mysteries," "the Divine Table," "the fearful and most tremendous cup"' (39 18).

It is not to be denied that some Fathers have used large words on small occasions, which may serve to give a character to the whole of their testimony. Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria use these extravagant terms more freely than others—the former especially. But then, in truth, such terms are of no real use to the Ritualists, because they prove greatly too much for their purpose; for these Fathers reserve their strongest and most striking epithets for the layman as a priest, the layman's altar, and the layman's sacrifice. A specimen of the style in which Chrysostom speaks on this point is given 22 26, which the reader is especially requested to notice.

30. These things which the Ritualists would represent as such tremendous and inscrutable mysteries, the Fathers duly expounded to the initiated. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem says, in his general exposition of the mysteries to the initiated:—

'Thou wert called a catechumen . . . hearing mysteries and not understanding. When thou shalt hear what is written concerning 'mysteries, then shalt thou understand what hitherto thou knowest

not. (15 1). We deliver to thee a mystery, keep the mystery. (15 2). 'These mysteries which the Church now speaks to thee. (15 4). Let us now teach you exactly about the mysteries, that you may know the deep meaning to you-ward. (15 6). When in the succeeding expositions of the mysteries we have entered into the Holy of Holies, we shall then know the symbolical meaning of what is there accomplished.' (15 8).

In fact, these mysteries or sacraments were fully explained to the initiated, and special discourses were delivered by other Fathers besides Cyril for this purpose.—(See 17 15, 16; 19 2-16; 21 26, 27, 135-137).

31. But some men who are neither Romanists nor Ritualists have their minds strongly impressed with the idea that there is something profoundly mysterious in the Lord's Supper, and deprecate any attempt at a definite explanation of the nature of the signs, and the things signified as being irreverent, if not presumptuous. The late Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Longley, designated the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, 'that most mysterious of all mysteries.' Coming from such a quarter, and partaking of a testamentary character, such an utterance must be very impressive. Nevertheless, it is not scriptural, but rather savours of superstition. Archdeacon Denison in his 'Defence' (p. 41), and the Right Hon. Sir Robert Phillimore in his Judgment, *Shepherd v. Bennet* (p. 75), cite a passage from Sherlock illustrative of this superstition which is as follows :—'He discerns not this body of our Lord who sees not with the eye of faith Christ really present, under the species of bread and wine, though he conceive not the manner thereof . . . not curiously questioning, much less pragmatically defining the way and manner of His presence, as being deeply mysterious and inconceivable. These old verses, expressing the faith of the wisest of our Reformers, may satisfy every modest, humble, and sober-minded good Christian in this great mystery of godliness :—

"It was the Lord that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it,
And what the Word did make it,
So I believe and take it."—(P. 41.)

32. Dean Hook gives peculiar prominence to this pernicious superstition, the force of which we shall the more appreciate

while for a moment we connect him with his old ally Dr Pusey, whom he warmly defended, as he also did Dr Newman; and let it be distinctly understood that the Dean has not made any retraction of his Tractarian opinions, the most that can be said in his favour is, that he has remained stationary, while Dr Newman has advanced to Rome, and Dr Pusey has advanced quite as far, but strange to tell, has not wholly arrived there, his outer man being at Canterbury, and not at Rome. In the famous sermon for which Dr Pusey was suspended by the authorities of his University he affirms, 'I believe the consecrated elements 'become by consecration truly and really in an ineffable way 'His Body and Blood. I withhold my thoughts as to the 'mode of this great mystery, but as a mystery to adore it.' (35 1.) Now, Dean Hook very strongly commended this sermon and its author as follows:—'By the publication of 'your truly evangelical sermon on the Eucharist, you have 'put to silence the ignorance of foolish men, and I am only 'uttering the sentiment of thousands when I venture to affirm 'that it may be said of you, as it was said of one who suffered 'injustice from the Church of Rome, that if, peradventure, 'you have erred by loving your God too much, your enemies 'have erred by loving their neighbour too little.'—*Sermon at Consecration of St John's Church, Harwarden, 1843, Dedication*, p. 4. His own belief of there being an inscrutable mystery in the Lord's Supper as to how bread can be bread, and wine can be wine, and at the same time be the Body and Blood of Christ, is as follows:—

'Behold He takes bread; they are watching Him with anxiety and 'deep attention. His manner is more than usually solemn as He 'breaks the bread; He gives it to them, and tells them it is "His 'Body"—that Body which is broken for the redemption of man, and 'for the salvation of the world. The disciples eat, and they marvel 'at the great mystery. "This is my Body," here is a positive asser- 'tion, "Do this in remembrance of me," here is a direct command. 'Let me take these words, and in whatever sense Christ intended that 'they should be taken, so let my faith accept them. I see and feel 'that it is bread; but I also hear and believe the words of my Saviour, 'that in some mysterious and hidden way it is His Body. . . . With 'what awe must the disciples have partaken of that cup of blessing! 'There they saw their Lord sitting with them. What an awful mys- 'tery. And how does it continue a mystery to us! Christ is pre-

‘sent with us in the Holy Eucharist ; yet His Body is in heaven. O God, how wonderful art thou ! Let me not question but adore.’ *Meditations for every day in Lent. Sunday next before Easter*, pp. 168-169.

33. These examples of the use and application of the word mystery form a striking contrast to its use and application by those who first employed it, and as it was employed for many centuries after. The only resemblance between the two is, that both use the word, but in a sense as opposite to each other as the poles ; the one understanding, or rather misunderstanding it in relation to the consecrated elements, as unknowable and incomprehensible, using nearly all the qualifying terms of the English dictionary, not, of course, to explain it, but to show how hopelessly inexplicable it is. Whereas the other (Cyril, for instance, as a specimen of the Fathers generally) explains it as used in Church rites in five short lectures, and had the rites in the fourth century been as few and simple as they were in the first, and as they now are, as contained in our Liturgy, one short lecture would have been amply sufficient ; for, as we shall have occasion to notice shortly, the mysteries which they kept secret, which required to be revealed, were of mere human origin. Dean Hook, in the ‘Meditations,’ he has published, instructs those who accept his teaching to conceive of the consecrated elements as an awful and continuous mystery. Cyril in the fourth century, in his catechetical lectures to those about to approach the Lord’s Table duly expounds the mystery. The Dean instructs his disciples to say, ‘I believe, that in some mysterious and hidden way, ‘bread is His body.’ Cyril, after having explained to his disciple how bread was Christ’s Body, viz., a sign of it, addresses him thus—‘O taste and see that the Lord is good. ‘Trust not the decision to thy bodily palate, no, but to faith ‘unfaltering ; for when we taste, we are bidden to take, not ‘bread and wine, but the antitype [sign, symbol, or representation] of the body and blood of Christ.’ (15 15.)

34. Bishop Browne, in his book on the Articles, has recorded his belief of there being a profound mystery as to how the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, and ascribes such a belief to that most illustrious divine, Calvin :

and if the reader had no other means of knowing Calvin's sentiments than as quoted by Dr Browne, he could not feel otherwise than certain that such were the real sentiments of Calvin. But nothing could be farther from the truth. Dr Browne states,

'We, of the Church of England, who believe Christ really present in His sacraments, and spiritually there feeding our souls, as much as those who look for a natural reception of Him, can feel the truth and awfulness of such apostolic warnings. We do not differ with the believers in transubstantiation, so far as their statement goes, that in the Eucharist there is a real presence of the Lord. And therefore we feel as they do, that to receive unworthily is to dishonour to the body of Christ. Our difference with them is not concerning the truth of Christ's presence, which the apostle's words seem forcibly to teach us ; [not setting apart as holy the body of the Lord], but we differ with them concerning the mode. That they define carnally, whilst we believe it mystically. [Does he mean mysteriously or sacramentally ?] And herein we can scarcely use words more apposite than the words used long ago by Calvin : " If any ask,"' &c.

For the remainder of the citation see 30 16, the latter part in brackets. Immediately after the citation, he remarks, 'So Calvin ; and so our Hooker ; " What these elements are in " themselves it skilleth not. It is enough that *unto me that take them*, they are the body and blood of Christ,"' pp. 724, 725.

35. From this representation of Dr Browne, we are obliged to infer that Calvin is actually speaking of the mysterious mode in which the consecrated elements can be the body and blood of Christ. He is not speaking of this at all, but of the mode in which believers are incorporated with Christ, as may be seen from what immediately precedes the citation made by Dr Browne. (30 16.) Calvin in effect denies that there is any presence in the consecrated bread. Elsewhere, in the same great work, he settles it as 'a fixed point, that the office of the sacraments differs not from the word of God' (30 7), that, in fact, a sacrament is a visible word. (30 1.) He affirms, 'This discourse does not relate to the Lord's Supper, but to the ordinary uninterrupted communication of the flesh of Christ, which we obtain apart from the use of the Lord's Supper,' &c. (30 3.) He states that 'Christ gives Himself daily, when in the word of the gospel He offers Himself to

'be partaken by us.' (30 8.) He then goes on to explain what it is to be a real partaker of Christ, and to have communion with His flesh and blood, not necessarily in the sacrament, but apart from it, as well as in it, and in both cases by faith only. (30 3.) But the believer's communion and union with Christ he represents as a most sublime mystery which he could not pretend to explain. (30 12.) Yet he says, 'I will however, give a summary of my view as best I can.' (30 13.) The view there given has no reference whatever to any incomprehensible mystery in the consecrated elements, but to the believer's union with Christ. He concludes with the apostle, that it is a matter too high for utterance, and exclaims, 'this is a great secret.' (30 14.) What Calvin teaches here, he teaches also in a subsequent part of the chapter, which part Dr Browne cites as if Calvin was teaching that the mystery or sacrament of the Lord's Supper was an incomprehensible thing; whereas, he is really speaking of the sublime mystery or rather secret of the believer's union with Christ. (30 16.) The fact is, that Calvin teaches exactly the opposite of Dr Browne, deprecating the very thing which he appears to encourage and cherish. (30 2.)

36. But there is still worse to come, for if Bishop Browne has stumbled much at Calvin, he has stumbled much more at Hooker. Respecting this supposed profound mystery in regard to the consecrated elements, he connects Hooker with Calvin, and remarks, 'So Calvin; and so our own Hooker: "What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not; it is enough that *unto me that take them* they are the body and blood of Christ."' (p. 725.) Hooker is here speaking as an avowed Sacramentarian. In the very section of the book from which the Bishop has made the citation, what he has represented as four opinions on the presence in the Lord's Supper, viz.—1. Transubstantiation; 2. Consubstantiation; 3. The real spiritual presence; 4. The denial of any special presence altogether (p. 677.), Hooker has included in three, for he properly includes Zwingle in the third class, and consequently with him there is no place for the fourth as a definition of the opinion of Zwingle. The Bishop says 'Zwingle rejected sacramental grace entirely' (p. 594), and

Hooker denies that there is grace either in the sacrament of Baptism or of the Eucharist. The Bishop regarding a Zwinglian and a Sacramentarian as being equivalent, rejects both; Hooker, with the Reformers generally, excepting Luther, very properly ranks himself among the Sacramentarians. With these views of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, he says, 'What the elements are in themselves, it skilleth not; it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ.' What if the sacraments or consecrated signs did not contain the things of which they were the signs; if the elements did not contain the grace which they represented, notwithstanding, Hooker, as a devout believer in his Saviour and in His words, could well say—'What the elements are in themselves, it skilleth not (it makes no difference, it matters not, is of no interest); it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ. His promise in witness hercof sufficeth, His word He knoweth which way to accomplish: why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this: O my God, thou art true; O my soul, thou art happy?' (*Eccles. Pol.* v. 67.) In what sense the elements are to the devout communicant the body and blood of Christ, he distinctly states—'Is there anything more expedite, clear, and easy, than that as Christ is termed our life, because through Him we obtain life, so the parts of this sacrament are His body and blood, for they are so to us, who receiving them, receive that by them which they are termed? The bread and the cup are His body and blood, because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the participation of His body and blood ensueth.' Hooker states no other doctrine of the Eucharist than that of Zwingle, who says, 'You properly eat sacramentally, when you do the same thing inwardly which you perform outwardly.' (29 16.)

37. But Dr Pusey not only misinterprets such words as sacramental and sacramentally, mystical and mystically, but also such words as spiritual and spiritually. Such language, however, as spiritual presence, or Christ's being spiritually present in regard to the Eucharist, is almost exclusively the nomenclature of the Reformers, and as it would seem originated

with them. After the heresy arose of Christ's body being really present in the consecrated elements, the opponents of that carnal doctrine, while admitting the real presence of Christ in His Holy Supper, very correctly defined it as a spiritual presence. The Fathers occasionally used the phrase 'spiritual presence,' but this was descriptive of the presence of His divinity, not merely in His Holy Supper, but with believers generally, and this His spiritual presence is frequently spoken of in connection with His bodily absence. (See secs. 75-81 below.) Such phrases as 'spiritual presence,' 'present 'spiritually,' which the Reformers used as opposed to, and exclusive of, the presence of a body, Dr Pusey conveniently uses as inclusive and descriptive of the real presence of Christ's body in the consecrated elements. How the leading Reformers spoke, continental as well as English, may be seen from what follows :—

38. ZWINGLE.—'In the Supper of the Lord that natural 'and substantial body of Christ . . . is not eaten naturally, 'but only spiritually.' (29 14.) 'To eat the body of Christ 'spiritually, &c.' (29 15.) 'But do thou, O most benignant 'King, receive in a few words our sentiments concerning 'Christ's body how it is in the Supper. Yea, rather we do 'not believe that it is the Lord's Supper except Christ be 'present. This is confirmed. "Where two or three are met "'together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." 'How much more is He where the whole Church is congregated with Him?' (29 23.) 'But here we eat spiritually 'what exists there [in heaven] naturally.' (29 27.) 'The 'body of Christ which He assumed and keeps is a true body, 'is eaten in the Supper, but spiritually.' (29 27.) 'A true 'body is eaten in spirit, in mind, in soul.' (29 28.)

39. CALVIN.—'In the sacred Supper we are fed spiritually 'by the body and blood of Christ.' (30 4.) 'The body which 'you see not is to you a spiritual aliment.' (30 5.) 'The 'presence of Christ in the Supper.' (30 15.) 'They are 'greatly mistaken in imagining that there is no presence of 'the flesh of Christ in the Supper, unless it be placed in the 'bread. They thus leave nothing for the secret operation of 'the Spirit.' (30 16.) 'He alleges that I exhibit a supper

‘devoid of Christ, because I shut up Christ in heaven, just as Zwingle did. . . . He [a Lutheran] must necessarily admit that the presence of Christ is manifested without the use of the Supper, as well as in the Supper. The promise of Christ is “I am with you always, even to the end of the world,” &c. (30 32.)

40. CRANMER.—‘When I say and repeat many times in my book that the body of Christ is present . . . my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit of Christ’s body that was crucified for us, and of His blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments; but all this I understand of His spiritual presence, of the which He saith: “I will be with you until the world’s end,” &c. (31 1.) ‘The spiritual eating of His flesh, and drinking of His blood by faith,’ &c. (31 2.) ‘Doth not God’s word teach us a true presence of Christ in Spirit, where He is not present in His corporal substance? As when He saith . . . “I shall be with you till “the end of the world.”’ (31 5.) ‘I say Christ is spiritually and by grace in His supper, as He is when two or three are gathered together in His name, meaning that with both He is spiritually, and with neither corporally.’ (31 6.) ‘For they [the Israelites] spiritually by their faith were fed and nourished with Christ’s body and blood, and had eternal life by Him before He was born, as we have now who come after His ascension.’ (31 7.)

41. JEWEL.—‘Thus spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat the body of Christ and drink His blood,’ &c. (32 4.) ‘We say and believe that we receive the body and blood of Christ truly. . . . Yet lest any should be deceived, we say this meat is spiritual, and therefore it must be eaten by faith, and not with the mouth of our body. Augustine saith,’ &c. (32 7.)

42. In fact, so general were the above sentiments, that the Lutherans and Roman Catholics denounced and condemned them in the most formal manner. The Lutherans as follows:—

‘In order to the solid explanation of this controversy, it must first be said that there are two kinds of Sacramentarians. Some are gross Sacramentarians. These profess openly, in clear, plain words, what

‘they in their hearts believe, namely, that in the Lord’s Supper
 ‘nought else, save bread and wine, is present, or distributed, or re-
 ‘ceived orally. [These were the Anabaptists.] But other Sacra-
 ‘mentarians are ingenious and subtle, and indeed the most pernicious.
 ‘These, speaking on the subject of the Lord’s Supper, in part use our
 ‘words, and make a shew as though they too believed the true pre-
 ‘sence of the true, substantial, and living body and blood of Christ in
 ‘the holy Supper, yet this presence and eating, they say, is spiritual,
 ‘and takes place through faith. And these last mentioned Sacramen-
 ‘tarians conceal and retain under these specious words, the same gross
 ‘opinion of the former, *i.e.* that beyond bread and wine nothing is
 ‘present, or orally received in the Lord’s Supper. For the word
 ‘“spiritually” to them signifies nothing else, but the Spirit of Christ,
 ‘or the virtue of the absent body of Christ and its merits, which, they
 ‘say, is present; but the body itself of Christ, they think, is in no
 ‘wise present, but is only contained in the highest heaven above;
 ‘and they affirm that we ought, by thoughts of faith, to rise above,
 ‘and ascend into heaven, and that there, (but in no way with the
 ‘bread and wine of the holy Supper) that body and blood of Christ
 ‘are to be sought.’—*Formula Concordiæ*, c. 7, *de cœna Dom.* p. 460.

43. The Roman Catholics are so opposed to the opinions of the presence as held by the above Reformers, that they actually curse the holders thereof. Thus the Council of Trent declares, ‘If any man say that Christ, exhibited in the Eucharist, is
 ‘eaten spiritually only, and not sacramentally and really also,
 ‘let him be anathema.’—*Sess. xiii. de Euch.* c. 8.

44. Dr Pusey assumes with apparent complacency, but in reality with the most imperturbable audacity, that such phrases contained in the Book of Common Prayer as, ‘Then
 ‘we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood;
 ‘and, the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the
 ‘Supper, only after *a heavenly and spiritual manner*; and
 ‘the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten
 ‘in the Supper, is faith;’ (*Art. xxviii.*) are not to be under-
 stood, and were never intended to be understood, by the
 compilers of the Liturgy and the framers of the Articles as in-
 compatible with such a presence in the consecrated elements
 as that held by Lutherans, Roman Catholics, and himself. It
 seems incredible that such men as Cranmer and Jewel should
 so frame the services of the Church, and express its doctrines
 as to include the Roman Catholic doctrine of the real pre-
 sence. Why, then, were so many of them roasted alive?

Our chief object, however, is now to test Dr Pusey's doctrine by the teaching of the Fathers. The first point we have to notice is his bold assumption without any attempt at proof, namely, that Christ was born with a spiritual body. He says, 'We receive, without doubting, that our Lord, in His *spiritual* body, passed, on the morning of the resurrection, through the sealed tomb He passed through the closed doors, so that the disciples thought that "it was a spirit," as He had passed before *illæsa virginitate*, through the doors of the virgin's womb.' 35 11.)

45. What proof have we from Scripture and the early Fathers that Christ accomplished these events, or that they were accomplished by His having a spiritual body? As far as regards Holy Scripture, this has already been considered in chapter v. 7; and we now ask what Catholic Father ever expressed his belief that Christ performed these miracles in a spiritual body? Dr Pusey does not even pretend to tell us; and yet it is more than probable that some of his unlearned readers, and especially his simple disciples, would conclude that some leading Fathers had taught that Christ at His birth in a spiritual body had passed through material substances without displacing any of the parts, after the manner of a spirit; for in his Notes to illustrate and confirm the above citation, he states, 'The miracle of passing through the closed doors is compared with our Lord's birth, "ex utero clauso," by S. Augustine, S. Jerome (perhaps with reference also to His rising from the closed tomb), S. Gaudentius, S. Fulgentius, Theodore, S. Hilary, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, Theodotus of Ancyra, Eusebius of Gall, S. Gregory the Great. It is remarkable that the same comparison is retained even in the Lutheran Formula Concordiæ.' (pp. 58, 59.) It is for the most part true that these Fathers so named, with the exception of Jerome and Fulgentius, did entertain this foolish notion respecting the blessed Mary. But they repudiated with abhorrence the Marcionite heresy that Christ was born with a spiritual body. Thus Augustine in the very passages, to which Dr Pusey referred but did not consider it prudent to cite, shows how opposed he was to any such heretical notion. Thus he states, 'But to *the substance* of the body in which

‘was Godhead, closed doors were no obstacle. For truly He ‘had power to enter in by doors not open, in whose birth His ‘mother’s virginity remained inviolate.’ (*In Joh. Tr.* 121, 4.) Again, ‘If any therefore shall say to thee, If He entered ‘through closed doors, it was not a body, answer thou, Nay, ‘if He was touched, it was a body; if He ate, it was a body; ‘and He did that by miracle, not by nature.’ (*Serm.* 247, 2.) Again, ‘Nor let us listen to them who deny that there arose ‘such a body of our Lord, as was laid in the sepulchre. For ‘had it not been such, He would not Himself have said to the ‘disciples after His resurrection, “Handle, and see, for a spirit ‘hath not bones and flesh, as ye see me have.” . . . Nor ‘let it move us, that it is written, that when the doors were ‘shut, on a sudden He appeared unto His disciples, that ‘therefore we should deny it to have been a human body, ‘because we see it to be contrary to the nature of this body ‘to enter through closed doors.’ (*De Ag. Christ.* c. 24.) These are the passages to which we are referred by Dr Pusey, but there is nothing in them in favour of the notion that Christ had a spiritual body, but, on the contrary, that He had a natural and human one. But there are very many other Fathers who did not entertain this foolish notion respecting the blessed Virgin, such as Irenæus, Tertullian, Methodius, Origen, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Gregory Nyssen, Theophylact, and others.

46. It will be quite sufficient to give the testimony of three of these Fathers on the point: Tertullian, Jerome, and Fulgentius. The two former are the leading Christian authors of the ages in which they lived. Tertullian, in his Treatise on the Flesh of Christ, states, ‘Valentinus, indeed, on the ‘strength of his heretical system, might consistently devise a ‘spiritual flesh for Christ.’ On the words, ‘Every male that ‘openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord,’ he remarks, ‘For who is really holy but the Son of God? Who ‘properly opened the womb but He who opened a closed ‘one?’ (*Opera* cap. xv. xxiii. pp. 306, 311.) In his books against the heretic Marcion he makes similar statements.

47. Jerome is equally against Dr Pusey’s notion even in

the passage to which he alludes, though he does not cite it. It is as follows :—

‘ Why did the Lord eat a honeycomb? That He might prove His resurrection. He asked for broiled fish to confirm the doubting Apostles who did not dare to approach him, because they thought that they saw a spirit, not a body. As He showed real hands and a real side, so He did really eat with His disciples; He really did walk with Cleopas; His tongue really spoke with all; He reclined on a real couch at Supper, took bread with real hands, blessed and broke it and reached it to them. But because He suddenly vanished from their sight was owing to the power of God, not to a shadow and apparition. Moreover, also, before His resurrection, when they led Him from Nazareth to throw Him from the brow of a hill, He passed through the midst, that is, He escaped (*elapsus est*) out of their hands. Can we say, like Marcion, that because He, who was held contrary to nature, escaped (*elapsus est*), therefore his nativity was in an apparition. Is not what is allowed to a magician allowed to the Lord? . . . I do not wish to compare the Lord’s power to the illusion of the magicians, as if He appeared to be what He was not, and is thought to have eaten without teeth, to have walked without feet, to have broken bread without hands, to have spoken without a tongue, to have showed His side without ribs. And how thou sayest, did they not know Him on the way if He had the very body which He had before? Was He one when they did not know Him, and another when He was known? Certainly He was one and the same. To know, therefore, and not to know, belong to the sight, not to Him who was seen, although it was of Himself; for He held their eyes that they might not know Him. Lastly, thou shouldest know that the error was not owing to the body of the Lord who passed in the midst, but to their closed eyes. Their eyes were opened, it is said, and they knew Him’ (*Ad Pam. adversus Errores Joan. Hieros.* tom. ii., p. 177).

Elsewhere Jerome states—‘ But Christ was born of a virginal womb, concerning whom it is written, “ Every one that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord.” . . . For Christ only, opened the closed gates of the virginal womb’ (*Adver. Pelag. lib. ii., tom. ii., p. 281*). Fulgentius repeats the same thing (*De Incarn., cap. xiii*).

48. Dr Pusey might have cited on his side his great Father Paschasius, for, as certainly as Jubal was the father of such as handle the harp and organ, so Paschasius was the father of all such as believe the real presence of Christ’s body and blood in the consecrated bread and wine. In the same spirit in which he taught the doctrine of the Real Presence, he zealously main-

tained a miraculous delivery of the blessed Mary. But here again Bertram, his more learned and successful opponent, refuted his strange opinion. Paschasius, respecting the birth of Christ, came to the following conclusion:—‘Ideo sicut (Christus) clausis visceribus jure creditur conceptus, ita omnino et clauso utero natus. Non est credendum, quod ejus (Mariæ) puerperium doloribus et gemitibus more feminarum subjacuerit, Christus de Virgine speciali et ineffabili quodam modo procreatus, absque vexatione matris ingressus est mundum sine dolore et sine gemitu et sine ulla corruptione carnis’ (*In d’Achery Spicileg.* i. 42). Paschasius had such enormous powers of belief that a basis on which he might rest it was a trifle which he did not much regard. His disciples have, in a very marked manner, become possessed of the like powers. His random speculations, however, were well answered by the learned and sober-minded Bertram, who, among other things, said—‘Dogmatizans Christi infantiam, per vaginalis januam vulvæ, humanæ nativitatis verum non habuisse ortum, sed monstruose de secreto ventris incerto tramite luminis in auras exisse, quod non est nasci, sed erumpi. Jam ergo nec vere natus Christus, nec vere genuit Maria.’ He concludes—‘Ergo omnifarium adversario devicto, teneamus vera fide, confiteamur ore veridico, verbum carneno-factum, per ministerium vulvæ naturaliter natum, et secundum rationis consequentiam, et secundum divinarum testimonia Scripturarum et secundum doctorum non contemnendum auctoritatem. Satis abundeque, ut æstimo, monstratum est, Dominum Salvatorem de Virgine sicut hominem natum, non ut integritatem violaret illa nativitas, quia Maria virgo fuit ante partum, virgo in partu, virgo mansit et post partum; sed ut qui de virgine corpus assumsit, et intra gremium virginale concrevit, per aulam quoque virgineam naturaliter nasceretur.’ (*In d’Achery Spicileg.* i. 52, c. 1, 10.)

49. It is sufficiently clear from the above evidence, both from the Fathers who entertained the foolish notion respecting the blessed Mary, and those who did not, that they alike repudiated the idea of Christ having a spiritual body, whether before or immediately after, His resurrection; and from their own statements we are led to conclude that it was in fact the

heresy of Marcion and Jovinian. It will be seen from the above citations that neither Jerome nor Fulgentius held the foolish opinion Dr Pusey ascribes to them, and therefore ought not to have been included in his list. Here is a distinct instance where Dr Pusey makes one heresy to depend upon another. If Christ, at His birth, had a body which could pass through membraneous substances without displacing any of their parts, why might not the same body be in bread? Dr Pusey has referred to this most egregious part of Patristic folly for no other reason than that his readers might draw this inference (35 11). But this is not all; he not only rakes up and drags this folly into public view, but he also believes it, and, what is still worse, founds upon it a species of the Jovinian and Marcionite heresy, which the Fathers in question did not, for so far were they from believing that the miracles to which Dr Pusey alludes were performed by means of Christ having a spiritual body, they rigidly maintained that, however they were performed, Christ retained His natural and human body. Dr Pusey, elsewhere reasoning after the same manner and to the same effect as Dr Wiseman (34 18), states, ‘The Docetæ might equally interpret “The word was made flesh” as a figure, and contend that S. John’s words did not establish that our Lord had real flesh. Nor has one who interprets as a figure “This is my body” any answer to make to them’ (35 31). There would have been some force in his argument had he reasoned as follows:—The Docetæ might equally maintain that the Word was not made flesh, and contend that S. John’s words did not establish that our Lord had real flesh. Nor has Dr Pusey, who maintains that Christ gives His body a spiritual existence, and exists ‘as it were a spirit invisible and indivisible’ (35 67), and with this body was born, passed through a solid block of stone, closed doors (35 11), and exists, after the manner of a spirit in the consecrated bread, any answer to make to them. Dr Pusey, in contending for the substance of the sacramental elements after consecration, remarks, ‘Had the Church then believed that the elements were accidents without substance the Gnostics might have retorted, “Unsubstantial accidents are an appropriate figure of such a body as we conceive unsubstan-

‘“ tial.”’ (35 19). If there is any force in this argument against the doctrine of transubstantiation, there is exactly the same force against his doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ’s body and blood in the consecrated elements. Retaining the exact point of the argument, it may be stated thus :—Had the Church then believed, as Dr Pusey does, viz., that Christ gives His body a spiritual existence, and exists as it were a spirit invisible and indivisible, and with this body was born, passed through a solid block of stone, closed doors, and exists after the manner of a spirit unsubstantial in the consecrated elements ; the Gnostics might well reply, ‘Substantial elements of bread and wine, such as you believe to exist, are ‘inappropriate figures of such a body as you conceive.’

50. Tertullian argued from the consecrated elements, in answer to Marcion, that the body of Christ was not a phantom, but really consisted of flesh and blood. Not that these were really, carnally, and visibly in the consecrated elements, or that the flesh and blood of Christ were in the consecrated bread and wine after the manner of a spirit, for this latter notion would in effect confirm the pernicious opinion of Marcion, not refute it. Thus, Tertullian himself states :—‘When ‘treating of the Gospel, we have proved from the sacrament ‘of the bread and the cup the reality of Christ’s body and ‘blood, in opposition to Marcion.’ (10 15). The following is a fair specimen of his argumentation :—‘Then having taken ‘the bread, and given it to His disciples, He made His own ‘body that by saying, “This is my body”—that is, the figure ‘of my body. But it would not be a figure, unless His body ‘were a true body. But an empty thing, as a phantom is, ‘can admit of no figure of itself.’ (10 12). This is most fatal to Dr Pusey’s notion that Christ’s flesh and blood are really present in the consecrated bread and wine after the manner of a spirit. Between flesh and body Tertullian made no distinction ; he says, ‘Indeed, I see no other substance in man ‘after spirit and soul to which the term body can be applied ‘except the flesh. This, therefore, I understand to be meant ‘by the word “body,” as often as the latter is not specifically ‘named.’ (10 16).

51. If it is the nature of Christ’s body to be present after

the manner of a spirit, then it is not so unreasonable to infer that it may be present in an indefinite number of places at the same time; the very thing which the doctrine of the real presence, as held by Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Dr Pusey, requires. This doctrine, as held by Luther and his immediate followers, was as gross as that held by Roman Catholics; we do not think, then, with Dr Pusey, that there is anything remarkable in Lutherans attaching importance to, and believing the folly entertained by a few of the Fathers respecting the blessed Mary; but it is very remarkable that they and Dr Pusey should turn it to *their* own account, contrary to the meaning of the Fathers from whom they adduced it.

52. Dr Pusey, in his laborious defence of Archdeacon Denison, had also to defend himself against Dean Goode, and in doing so, gives reasons for his belief that the body of Christ is present in the consecrated elements after the manner of a spirit, and not after the manner of a body, and he maintains that this is the doctrine of the Church of England. He states the matter thus—‘Mr Goode has ridiculed the belief that in ‘the Holy Eucharist the body and blood of Christ are present, ‘yet not after the manner of a body, but as I have often repeated spiritually, sacramentally, mystically,’ &c. (*The Real Presence*, &c., p. 204). Dr Pusey employs every one of the defining words in the above extract in a sense unknown to the early Fathers, and repudiated by the Reformers.

53. We shall now notice how Dean Goode ridicules the belief of the real presence, which Dr Pusey accepts as his own. The truth is, the Dean employed Bishop Taylor, who ridiculed the belief of the Roman Catholics. The Dean states:—

‘A body such as that which our Lord assumed must have a local presence, and can only be in one place. “I appeal,” says Bishop Taylor again, “to any man of the Roman persuasion, if they can show “me any philosopher, Greek, or Roman, or Christian of any nation, “who did not believe it to be essential to the being of a body to be “in one place . . . and therefore to make the body of Christ to be “in a thousand places at once, and yet to be but one body, to be in “heaven and to be upon so many altars . . . is to make a body to “be a spirit, and to make a finite to be infinite; for nothing can be “so but an infinite Spirit.” And, therefore, he ridicules the notion ‘of Christ’s body being in the sacrament, and yet not there *locally*, as ‘nonsense, saying, “I wish the words were sense, and that I could

“tell the meaning of being in a place locally and not locally, unless
 “a thing can be in a place and not in a place, that is, so to be *in*
 “that it is also *out*.”” (*See the Eucharist*, p. 51.)

Both Roman Catholics and Lutherans, in the time of Zwingle, ‘said we eat the spiritual body of Christ.’ How Zwingle spoke on the point may be seen. (29 6.)

54. Dr Pusey, to prove this sort of presence, alleges the testimony of Bertram, and by him endeavours to prove that it is the doctrine of the Church of England. He says—‘The same doctrine is repeatedly stated by Bertram, to whom ‘Ridley and Cranmer frequently referred, and whose disciples ‘they wished to be.’ (*The Real Presence*, &c., p. 205.) He also tells us that ‘Paschasius Radbertus uses the same language.’ (*Ibid.* p. 208.) The portions which Dr Pusey cites from Bertram will be found 25 10, 26, 32-37, and from Paschasius 33 27. But these citations, and the use Dr Pusey makes of them, have already been considered, and, it is thought, satisfactorily disposed of, as may be seen in ch. viii., more especially secs. 3-6, 13-15.

55. The disciples of Paschasius of the present day seem to have a profound interest in bringing into agreement the teaching of their master with that of his opponent Bertram, who in all the main points of the present controversy plainly contradicts him, which has been shown in a previous chapter (viii. 1-44). Dr Pusey’s attempt at harmonizing the sentiments of these two monks in regard to the real presence of Christ in the consecrated elements is quite left in the shade, compared with that of Archdeacon Freeman, who appears to possess a very strong imagination. He says—

‘It is commonly represented, however, that controversy concerning ‘the Eucharist commenced early in the ninth century. Paschasius ‘Radbertus (in 820) on the one hand, and Ratramnus [another name ‘for Bertram], Rabanus Maurus, and others (840-850), on the other, ‘have maintained diametrically opposite views upon the subject. But ‘in truth, on a careful examination of their writings, no such opposition can be discovered. That the writers nowhere impugn each other ‘by name is confessed. . . . It has been said, indeed, and the opinion ‘has very widely prevailed, that Paschasius affirmed the annihilation ‘of the elements in their proper nature. But there is no such statement in his writings; nor does Ratramn, or any other contemporary ‘of his, charge him with holding this opinion. . . . The nearest

'approach to a denial of the existence of the elements, in Paschasius, 'is in his first chapter. "Although the figure of bread and wine "remains, these things are believed to be after the consecration "nothing else than the body and blood of Christ." [33 1.] Again, "Where certainly (John vi. 53) He speaks of no other than real "flesh and real blood, although *mystically*, whence because the sacrament is mystical, we cannot deny that it is a figure." [33 4.] 'Ratramn himself could not say more. He speaks as Paschasius does 'too of the bread as "the figure of Christ's body," and the like expressions. As *e.g.*, "It is plain that the bread and wine are *figuratively* the body and blood of Christ." [25 8.] That the opposition 'commonly assumed to exist between Paschasius and Ratramn '(Bertram) is, to say the least, very equivocal, appears from hence 'that some, however improbable, have thought that they were one and 'the same person. And we have seen that they employ, on occasion, 'language almost identical.' (*The Principles of Divine Service*, sec. v., pt. ii., vol. II., pp. 35-37, 39.)

56. This is a strange contribution to modern Romish ecclesiastical literature; but it abounds with so much that is strange that we almost cease to wonder. In answer, we maintain that both Bertram and Rabanus Maurus held 'diametrically opposite views to Paschasius,' and actually opposed him with them, in proof of which we refer the reader to chapter viii. 1-44, 47, and to the full extracts from their respective treatises as given 25 and 33. That Paschasius and Bertram 'nowhere impugn each other by name' is accounted for, from the fact that the former was the Abbot of the latter, and one in subjection could not well openly and by name oppose his superior (see ch. viii. 1). Respecting Paschasius not affirming the annihilation of the elements, and Bertram not charging him with it, this much is quite certain, that the former held that, after the consecration, the bread and wine must be believed to be nothing else than the body and blood of Christ; that they were spiritual and incorruptible, and not capable of being digested by the receivers in the ordinary way. Bertram maintained, in opposition, that they were not spiritual, but corruptible, and were digested as any other food; and in regard to this last point, Rabanus Maurus, also in opposition, maintained the same thing (see ch. viii. 5, 22-24, 29, 47). It is not to be denied that they employ, on occasion, language 'almost identical,' and the instances adduced by the Archdeacon respecting their use of such terms as *mystically*, *figura-*

tively, and *figure*, are cases in point. The real question is, what do they mean by such words? The fact is, that probably Paschasius, for the first time in the history of the Church, attached new meanings to them; certainly Bertram denied his meanings, and most ably maintained his denial by the ancient leading Fathers. Paschasius maintained that the figure—the consecrated bread—was itself also the reality, viz., the body which was born of Mary, &c. This, Bertram flatly denied. The former so understood the words ‘spiritually’ and ‘mystically’ as to be inclusive of the real presence of Christ’s body and blood in the elements; the latter so understood them as to be utterly incompatible with the idea of the consecrated elements being the real body and blood of Christ.

57. From noticing a strange contribution to Romish ecclesiastical literature, we pass to a stranger contribution to ecclesiastical law. Sir Robert Phillimore, the Dean of Arches, in what may be called the defence of the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, has noticed the respective treatises of these two monks as follows :—

‘In the middle of the ninth century, Paschasius Radbert, Abbot of the monastery of New Corbey, in Saxony, wrote a treatise, in which he maintained, or was supposed to maintain, that, after consecration, the very body and blood, the same flesh, in which Christ was born, and in which He died, was physically substituted for the bread and wine, which, however, still appeared to remain. . . . Ratramn (Bertram), at the request of Charles the Bald, examined the book of Paschasius, and answered it, maintaining that the true doctrine of the Church was a real spiritual presence of Christ under the covering or veil (*sub tegumento, velamine, specie*) of the elements. This work became, from subsequent events, of great importance to the whole Church, and especially to the Church of England. About the year 970, Ælfric, Abbot of Malmsbury, wrote a sermon of the Paschal Lamb, and of the sacramental body and blood of Christ, and a letter to Wulfstone, Archbishop of York, in both of which he maintained the doctrine of Ratramn (Bertram); and in the former of which he reproduced the argument and some of the principal passages of Ratramn, “*pæne ad verbum*,” as the learned Cave says. . . . With respect to Ridley, it is certain, not only that Ratramn (Bertram) “first pulled him by the ear,” to borrow Ridley’s expression, but that he derived from the work of Ratramn those opinions upon the presence which he afterwards maintained, and which he endeavoured, as it should seem successfully, to instil into Cranmer. It is perhaps even more remarkable that, in the reign of Elizabeth, the Anglo-

‘Saxon Homily of Ælfrie was printed by order of Archbishop Parker, who, as will presently be seen, subscribed it, in company with his Suffragans, as containing both the ancient and present teaching of the Church on the presence.’ (*Judgment, &c., Sheppard v. Bennett*, pp. 14, 16.)

58. Here we have the foundation and part of the superstructure (the remainder of which will be given presently), to show that Mr Bennett is not a disciple of Paschasius but of Bertram, and as our Reformers, especially Cranmer and Ridley, avowed themselves to be the disciples of Bertram, so Mr Bennett is a disciple of these two bishops, on the principle that two or more things which are like one and the same thing, are like each other. Now had his lordship been adjudicating between two parties respecting some dispute about colours, and in giving his judgment in favour of one party, had decided that black was white, and adduced evidence and constructed arguments to prove it, the natural and charitable inference would be, that he was suffering from the infirmity of colour-blindness. But we maintain in all sincerity that his decision that Mr Bennett’s doctrine on the real presence is not like that of Paschasius but is like that of Bertram, admits of no extenuation whatever. The only substantial difference between Dr. Pusey and Paschasius is in regard to the elements after consecration, the former considering them to retain their nature, and when received, may be digested like any other food; the latter as we have shown above (sec. 56) maintained the converse of this. We have already proved that Dr Pusey’s doctrine on the real presence was well refuted by anticipation in the able treatise of Bertram. Now Mr Bennett on the doctrine in question has avowed himself to be a most obedient disciple of Dr Pusey, as our extracts from his writings show (37 3-8), with one exception, for the only point in which Dr Pusey appears to disagree with Paschasius, Mr Bennett appears to agree with him, for he maintains not only the actual and real presence of Christ’s body and blood, in the consecrated elements, but also His visible presence. Now this statement, as revised by himself, and the revision glossed by telling us what he meant by it (37 1, 2), brings his doctrine into exact accord with that of Paschasius, who holds that after consecration in regard to the elements ‘Without the veil of any mystery the sight gazeth on that body outwardly, which the

‘eye of the soul inwardly beholdeth.’ (25 3.) Whether this was so or not was the very question which Bertram’s prince put before him. (25 3.) Mr Bennett assures us that he meant exactly the same things by his amended statements as he did by his original ones. (37 2.) Probably if he had made a second revision of his statements, one too which would have expressed his meaning without telling us what he meant by it, we should have had the exact sentiments of Paschasius as stated above. And we maintain that thus far Dr Pusey himself ought to believe in the like visible presence, for has he not instituted an analogy between a living man and the consecrated elements, and has not Mr Makonochie also? And as the latter substantially but more concisely expresses the same sentiment as the former, we shall give his statement the preference. He says, ‘God made man of the dust of the earth. ‘Here we have the senseless, lifeless form. “God breathed “into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living “soul.” He did not cease to be what he was before—dust ‘of the earth, but he became what he was not before—a living ‘soul. So in the Eucharist, God made bread and wine of the ‘dust of the earth. God the Holy Ghost breathes over it in ‘the act of consecration. It does not cease to be what it was ‘before, but it becomes what it was not before—the life-‘giving body and blood of Christ.’ (For this and more on the same subject see ch. v. 2, and 1-6.) Dr. Pusey and Mr Makonochie would not hesitate to speak of the *visible* presence of a living man. According then to their own analogy they ought not to hesitate to speak of the *visible* presence of Christ’s body and blood. Of course, in either case they only see what is outward, but so far the presence is visible, and to use the phraseology which expresses the faith of Paschasius in looking on the consecrated elements, ‘The sight gazeth on that body ‘outwardly which the eye of the soul inwardly beholdeth.’

59. When the Dean of Arches would give his audience, and now his readers, to understand that Paschasius maintained, or was supposed to maintain, that after consecration the very body and blood . . . were physically substituted for the bread and wine which, however, still appeared to remain; it is answered he himself does not say so, but affirms that the

whole is spiritual, and Dr Pusey, as we have seen, cites him to that effect. (33 27.) On the same ground that Paschasius may be considered to have maintained that the very body and blood of Christ were physically substituted for the bread and wine, so assuredly may all Roman Catholics, Dr Pusey, and his devoted disciple Mr Bennett.

60. We now proceed to give the remainder of the grounds on which his lordship assumes that Mr Bennett teaches the same doctrine as Bertram. He says, 'Let me begin with 'those two authorities to whom I have already referred, and 'who demonstrate the identity of the present doctrine of the 'Church of England with that which she has maintained from 'Anglo-Saxon times, upon the subject of the presence in the 'Eucharist. I select the following passages from the famous 'treatise of Ratramn.' (*Ibid.* pp. 31, 32.) Here follow the passages in the original Latin, translations of which will be found in 25 secs. 7, 8 and 9, with the exception of the last sentence, the latter part of 16, beginning with the words, 'As 'then a little before,' &c., secs. 34, 35, 58 and 59. Before citing the work of Ælfric he gives the preface of Parker, in which he rejects its reports of vain miracles and other words sounding to superstition, and commends 'almost the whole 'sermon,' which 'is about the understanding of the sacramental 'bread and wine, how it is the body and blood of Christ our 'Saviour, by which is revealed and made known what hath 'been the common taught doctrine of the Church of England 'on this behalf many hundred years ago, contrary to the un-'advised writing of some nowadays.' In commendation of this sermon are subscribed the names of fifteen bishops, including Parker, 'with divers other personages of honour and credit.' Then his lordship cites the title and several extracts, which are given, 27 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-12, and 14. Sections 2, 4, 7, 13, 15 and 16 are judiciously omitted. The part which he has cited from Ælfric's Epistle is given 27 17. Section 18 he has withheld.

61. We have now briefly to show that neither of these authors teaches Mr Bennett's or Dr Pusey's doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, but both, by anticipation, in effect refute it. His

Lordship has stated that Bertram ‘maintained that the true ‘doctrine of the Church was a real spiritual presence of Christ ‘*under the covering, under the veil, or under the form of the ‘elements*’ (sec. 57 above). His Lordship also gives, apparently with approval, Bishop Hampden’s statement of Bertram’s doctrine of the presence, which is as follows:— ‘Ratramn (Bertram) indeed distinctly asserts a *real* presence, ‘though he does not admit a presence of the crucified body of ‘Christ in the consecrated bread and wine. It is a real and ‘true presence that he asserts—the virtue of Christ acting in ‘the way of efficacious assistance to the receiver of the sacrament. The Church of England doctrine of the sacraments, ‘it is well known, is founded on the views given by this author. ‘Cranmer and Ridley are said to have studied his work together, ‘and to have derived their first ray of light on the subject from ‘that study’ (*Judgment, &c., p. 35*).

62. This statement, for the most part, may be accepted as the truth. Perhaps the Bishop is not quite accurate in representing ‘the virtue of Christ acting in the way of efficacious ‘assistance to the receiver of the sacrament,’ which is really the doctrine of Bertram, as tantamount to an assertion of ‘a ‘real and true presence of Christ.’ This presence, if such it may be called, cannot really be in the elements, and can only be realized by the devout communicant. According to this account of Bertram’s doctrine he is not for, but exactly against, Mr Bennett and his teacher, Dr Pusey. Mr Bennett’s doctrine, both in its original and amended form, is given (37 1, 2). Mr Bennett then believes that there is a ‘real and actual presence of our Lord under the form of bread.’ This presence, too, is explained as inclusive of His body and blood, and, of course, their real and actual presence.

63. This emended doctrine of Mr Bennett is not only essentially different from that which is attributed by Bishop Hampden to Bertram, but is far from being in accord with the doctrine which the Dean of Arches attributes to him. In the one case we have the real *spiritual* presence of Christ; in the other, the real presence of His body and blood without the qualifying word *spiritual*. Before we briefly state the real doctrine of Bertram upon this point, the reader should have

before him the exact point of difference between Bertram and Paschasius. Paschasius maintained that when Christ said 'this is my body,' 'this is my blood,' He meant His words to be understood literally; and that in or with the bread and wine there was the real presence of His body and blood, and not any figurative representation of them (33 2, 3, 4, 15, 28, 29). Bertram rigidly maintained the exact opposite of this teaching. One out of many instances may be seen (25 4-6) which the reader will do well to consult.

64. The Dean of Arches has told us that Bertram taught that there was 'the real spiritual presence of Christ under the veil (*sub velamine*) of the elements.' This statement is well calculated to mislead the unlearned reader. He would naturally infer that, in or under the consecrated elements, there was the real but spiritual presence of Christ. Bertram has no such meaning. He speaks of Christ as being represented in or under the veil of a figure—that is, such metaphorical words as bread and a vine; thus he says, 'Figure is a certain out-shadowing which exhibiteth what it meaneth *under* some sort of veil; for instance, when we would speak of the Word, we say bread; as in the Lord's Prayer, we pray that God would give us our daily bread; or, as Christ in the Gospel saith, "I am the bread which came down from heaven;" or, when He calleth Himself a vine and His disciples the branches, saying, "I am the true vine and ye are the branches"' (25 5). Respecting these metaphorical words, he very properly says that Christ is not 'substantially or really bread, nor is Christ a vine, nor are the Apostles branches. So that in this case a figure is presented in the expression but not reality, that is the naked and open signification' (25 6). When the Dean of Arches says 'that Bertram taught that there was "the real spiritual presence of Christ *under the veil* of the elements,"' he ascribes that to Bertram which he, in effect, plainly denies, if we allow him to interpret his own language. For with him, although Christ called the consecrated bread His body, it was not more really His body, He was not more really under the veil of bread, than bread or a vine was really Himself, or He was under the veil of either of those things, when He said 'I am the living bread,' 'I am the true vine.' Elsewhere Ber-

tram uses the phrase ‘under the veil, &c.,’ which, when taken apart from the context, and his own interpretation disregarded, seems to answer the Dean’s purpose very well, and especially as quoted in connection with the phrase, ‘under the forms of bread and wine,’ so popular with the Ritualists, and introduced thus—‘Ratramn (Bertram), it will be seen, adopted pretty much the same form of expression. “Yet because they do confess that they are the body and blood of Christ, and that they could not be so, but by a change wrought for the better; and since this change is not corporally but spiritually wrought, it must needs be said to be wrought figuratively, since *under the veil of corporeal bread and corporeal wine, there is a spiritual body and spiritual blood.*”’ (pp. 71, 72). The phrase, ‘under the forms of bread and wine,’ is, in itself, innocent of the doctrine which Ritualists would evoke out of it, as we have shown in ch. x. 57, 58, 61-70; and the part of the above extract italicized by the Dean, which he says is pretty much like it, if accompanied by the illustrations and commentary which Bertram gives, will be found very much against the doctrine of Mr Bennett, and not for it. Bertram goes on to show that the water of Baptism stands in the same relation to that which it signifies or represents as the elements of the Eucharist. No one could pretend that, *under the veil of corporal water*, there was the reality of which it was the sacrament or sign. He then adverts to the sacraments of the Church in the wilderness, and shows the parallel between them and the Christian sacraments. The reader will find the extract in question in 25 10; and by considering the four sections immediately following, he will see that Bertram expressly maintains with Augustine and other Fathers that in the same sense, and in no other, as the manna in the wilderness was the body of Christ, and the water from the rock was His blood, to the pious Israelites, so the consecrated bread in the Eucharist is the body of Christ, and the consecrated wine His blood, to the believing communicants. But does not such teaching imply an actual and real presence of Christ’s body and blood in these several cases, or that our Lord and His Apostle spoke in a figure? Dr Pusey shall give the answer. ‘Nor is there any case in Holy

'Scripture in which, being figurative, it is not indicated in the context that it *is* figurative. . . . S. Paul does not say, "that Rock was Christ," until he had before said, "that "spiritual rock"—showing that he spake in a figure.' (35 15.)

65. On referring to 25 10, it will be seen that Dr Pusey has cited the same passage after the same manner, and has italicized what he considered suited his purpose, but has omitted the illustrations and exposition. Such a practice is calculated to deceive the unlearned and unsuspicious reader. Another phrase used by Bertram, which the Dean of Arches has turned to his own account, is, 'under the covering' (*sub tegumento*), which, as he has employed it, would seem to bring Bertram into harmonious accord with both Romanists and Romanizers. He says, 'Ratramn (Bertram) . . . maintaining that the true doctrine of the Church was a real spiritual 'presence of Christ *under the covering* of the elements' (*Judgment, &c.*, p. 14). The phrase in question is only used once by Bertram; in fact it is not his own, but Isidore's, who is an earlier writer, and whom he cites against Paschasius (25 25). But this nomenclature which Romanizers have of late turned so much to their own account, and which his Lordship uses in defence of Mr Bennett, as here employed, is not for the accused, but is really against him. Isidore does not say that, under the cover of consecrated bread and consecrated wine, there is the real presence of Christ's body and blood. His use of the phrase in question is fatal to such a conclusion, and most certainly does not here imply it. Here, in common with other Fathers, those two Christian rites, Baptism and the Eucharist, which we designate as two sacraments, Isidore represents as four. Thus he says—'The sacraments are Baptism and Chrism, the Body and Blood. These are called 'sacraments, because *under the covering* of bodily things, &c.' (25 25).

66. We are not to infer from this style of speech that under the cover of the bodily thing, water, in Baptism, there is the actual and real presence of that which is represented or signified; nor are we to infer that under the cover of the bodily thing oil in confirmation, there is the actual and real

presence of the Holy Ghost, least of all, that whoever receives the bodily thing in either case, receives also the thing signified, that is, not only the sacrament, but the thing signified by the sacrament; yet these very things might with equal truth be affirmed of the other two sacraments, and consequently, however plausibly this nomenclature may be employed in the defence of Mr Bennett, when correctly understood, it is entirely against him. But each of these two sacraments, which Isidore calls body and blood, is represented by Bertram in a twofold aspect, as may be seen, **25 42-44**. Under the covering of the bodily thing bread, Bertram, with the Fathers generally, understood not only the body of Christ, but His true disciples also, and he argues therefrom as follows:—‘And as ‘that bread is called the body of believers not corporally’ or really, ‘but spiritually, so also must we understand the body ‘of Christ not corporally’ or really, ‘but spiritually.’ (**25 42, 43.**)

67. According to Bertram and the general consent of antiquity, the Eucharistic cup consisted of two elements, water and wine; and he argued in answer to Paschasius that if the wine by the act of consecration was changed corporally or really into the blood of Christ, so also the water which was mixed with it must necessarily be corporally, or really changed into the blood of the faithful people. But as it is certain that the water was not changed into the real blood of the people, so is it equally certain that the wine was not changed into the real blood of Christ. He concludes thus—‘Whatever in the water ‘signifieth the people of Christ is taken spiritually; whatever ‘therefore in the wine representeth the blood of Christ, must ‘be taken spiritually too.’ (**25 44.**)

68. Completely to refute Mr Bennett and his teacher Dr Pusey, with the testimony of Bertram, were an easy task; to vindicate them by it is simply impossible. The treatment which the testimony of Bertram in regard to the matters in dispute has received at the hands of the Dean of Arches in defence of Mr Bennett is utterly unaccountable; and his citations from Bertram’s most able treatise are equally perplexing. The sections in which they occur in our extracts from Bertram are given above (Sec. 60). The reader is especially requested

to note well what his lordship has quoted and what he has omitted to quote. His last citation we cannot pass over without notice. It is given, (25 58, 59.) This consists of an extract from one of the most important parts of Augustine's writings, relating to the symbolic import of the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, accompanied with the remarks of Bertram. A portion of this extract his lordship has honoured with italics, which we have reproduced in the translation. (25 58.) Now it is only by misunderstanding or perverting the language of Augustine and that of his interpreter that both can be considered to teach Mr Bennett's doctrine. But his lordship, like Dr Pusey (21 135), has garbled the testimony of Augustine by citing the less important part of his discourse, and omitting to cite the more important and explanatory part of it. The part which his lordship and Dr Pusey have omitted is introduced by Bertram thus: 'When Augustine would speak somewhat more openly 'and clearly of the mystical body, he addeth the following ' words:—The reader must consult for himself the statement of Augustine and Bertram's remarks thereupon (25 60, 61,) and he cannot but conclude that nothing could be more fatal to the doctrine of the real presence as held by Mr Bennett than it. For in the same sense, and in no other, in which the consecrated elements are the bodies of Christ's believing people; in that sense, and in no other, are they the body of Christ. Bertram had nearly come to the close of his most valuable and very able treatise in answer to Paschasius, and as a climax of evidence he chose this important passage from Augustine, and with his own appropriate and telling remarks thereon he completes his refutation of the doctrine of Paschasius, and accomplishes the task imposed upon him by his prince. (25 62-65.)

69. The manner in which his lordship has treated the testimony of Ælfrie is no better. The parts cited by him will be found. (27 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-12, 14, and 17.) In section 2, which is omitted, we are told that the Israelites through the sacrifice of the paschal lamb 'had signification after spiritual 'understanding of Christ's suffering; and that we receive 'spiritually Christ's body and drink His blood when we re-

‘ceive with true belief that holy Eucharist.’ (27 2.) At the end of section 3 we have the words, ‘Some things be spoken of Christ by signification, and some by things certain.’ What things are spoken of Christ by signification, and what by things certain, are omitted. (27 4.) Ælfric says Christ is bread by signification, but is not so after true nature any more than He is a lamb or a lion. He apparently is citing Augustine where he is speaking of certain metaphors which were applied to Christ in Holy Scripture ; such as lamb, rock, lion, &c., and respecting which he says, that if any one shall say that Christ is any one of them in proper signification he blasphemeth. To these metaphors named by Augustine, Ælfric adds that of bread, from which we may conclude that if Paschasius or any one of his disciples should say that Christ was bread, or bread was Christ ; (with the Fathers these two phrases are regarded as equivalent see ch. xi. 45-47) in proper signification he would blaspheme. The omission by his lordship of this short but important statement forming the fourth section, obscuring if not destroying the force of the argument by making a break in its middle, is damaging in the extreme.

70. By omitting section seven the force and relevancy of what follows is thereby greatly weakened. The contrast between a real presence of Christ’s body and a spiritual one is most distinct. Again, his Lordship omits section thirteen, where it is plainly taught that some of the Israelites, by eating the manna spiritually understood, did thereby spiritually receive the heavenly meat—in fact, did what believers now do in receiving the sacramental bread, as the following section shows (27 13, 14). In the fifteenth section we are taught, not that the sacramental elements are actually and really Christ’s body and blood, but ‘a remembrance of Christ’s body, which He offered for us.’ This also is omitted, as well as the sixteenth section, every word of which is most important in the present controversy, and if it had been the intention of his Lordship to give the real sentiments of Ælfric the omission is inexplicable. The last omission is the eighteenth section, where we are most certainly taught that the believing Church in the wilderness received, though in different outward signs, exactly the same spiritual

food which the believing Christian Church now receives in the consecrated elements.

71. From this apparent digression we must turn again to Dr Pusey's doctrine of a spiritual presence of Christ's real body and blood in the consecrated elements. In his more recent writings he represents Christ as 'inventing another mode of 'existence of His body and blood, a spiritual existence.' Again, he says, 'He raises His body above the condition of a body, 'and gives it a spiritual mode of existence . . . so that it 'exists as if it were a spirit, invisible and indivisible' (35 67). He still further states, 'He contrived a way whereby He should 'be continually present on earth; present, not as when on 'earth, in one single place, but throughout the whole earth, 'wherever Christians are for Him to come to; wherever, 'according to His holy institution, His words consecrate the 'oblations to be His body and blood' (35 68). It is not necessary to dwell upon these reckless and fanatical utterances beyond noticing with what freedom and assurance Dr Pusey describes a thing ridiculous and absurd in itself, and perhaps first hatched in the brains of Paschasius, as a contrivance and invention of our Blessed Lord.

72. Mr Shipley, not unconscious of the inconsistency and absurdity of speaking of the presence of a body not after the manner of a body, notwithstanding boldly avows the sentiment. (39 13). So certain is Mr Shipley of the presence of the body of Christ being everywhere, that he says, 'In this sense 'are we to understand His own words when He said, "I am "'with you alway, even unto the end of the world?"' (39 1.)

How greatly Alcuin, the disciple of Bede, differed from Mr Shipley and his friends respecting the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and the application of the text 'Lo, I am 'with you,' may be seen from his chapter on the Celebration of the Mass, and its signification. He there states,

'Afterwards the priest says, "*The Lord be with you,*" saluting the 'people, and praying that the Lord may be with them, as is well said 'through the Prophet, "I will dwell in them," and what follows, and 'that which the Saviour said to His disciples, and in them to all the 'faithful, "Lo, I am with you." Which form of salutation is shown 'was not made by the human will, but was derived from the authority 'of the Divine Scriptures, where frequently it is employed both indi-

‘vidually and collectively—individually, as the angel to the blessed Mary, “Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee,” and as the angel in saluting in like manner Gideon, said, “The Lord is with thee, O “most valiant of men.” Collectively, as in the Book of Ruth it is read that Boaz, in saluting his reapers, said to them, “The Lord be “with you ;” and, as in Chronicles, his Prophet sent by God is found to have saluted Asa, king of Judah, with his army returning victorious from the battle, “The Lord is with you, for ye are with the “Lord.” The Church, therefore, having so received the wholesome salutation of the priest, itself also in returning the salutation, prays, and by praying, salutes again ; praying that as he besought the Lord to be with them, so He may be also with him, saying, “*And with Thy Spirit.*”’—(*De Divinis Officiis*, col. 1097, 1098.)

73. Remigius, Bishop of Auxerre, who died in the year 900, in his Treatise on the Mass, made nearly the same remarks on the same words.—*Bib. Vet. Patr.*, tom. ix., pt. ii., p. 541.

74. How Paschasius himself understood and applied the text in question, may be seen (33 30), and for the testimony of the universal consent of the Fathers see chapter i. 18-20.

75. The Fathers generally were so far from having any knowledge respecting what Dr Pusey attributes to Christ in regard to His inventing ‘another mode of existence of His ‘body and blood,’ and ‘contriving a way whereby He should ‘be continually present on earth’ by His real body and blood being in the consecrated elements (35 67, 68), that they are very explicit in accounting for the real absence of His body, of all that is human, but very joyously dwell upon the real presence of His divinity. Here follows a portion of their testimony upon this point.

76. Origen, in the most explicit manner possible, speaks of the real absence of Christ's body from the earth, of His real presence only in His divinity, and represents those as not of God [and for which he cites a text of Scripture as it stood in the manuscript used by him] who would disunite or do away with Jesus—that is, the man Jesus—in other words, the human soul and body of the Lord Jesus Christ (11 7). We beg the reader to examine fully the whole statement. Nothing could be more fatal to the heretical notion of Paschasius and his tribe of disciples, including Dr Pusey—namely, that the body of Christ, which was born of Mary, died on the cross,

and was laid in the sepulchre, is received whole and entire in each particle of consecrated bread by every recipient. Origen speaks as distinctly of the real absence of Christ's human substance from the faithful as he speaks of the real presence of His divinity, or of 'the Divine Power which was in Jesus,' with them. Could Origen, with his brilliant mind, have written thus if he had had the remotest conception of the above Paschasian notion?

77. Other Fathers cited 1 John iv. 3, after the manner of Origen, and employed it against a heresy not unlike that of Dr Pusey, namely, that the man Jesus, the human nature of Jehovah-Christ, could be born, could rise from the sepulchre, pass through closed doors, and subsist in consecrated bread and wine after the manner of a spirit, or a phantom, as Tertullian expresses it. In answer to Marcion, who held similar views, Tertullian applied the above text, after designating him an antichrist. Thus he says—'According to our view he is 'antichrist, as is taught us in both the ancient and the new 'prophecies, and by the Apostle John, who says that "already "many false prophets are gone out into the world," the fore-runners of antichrist denying (*negantes*) that Christ is come 'in the flesh, and dissolving or doing away with (*solventes*) 'Jesus, namely, in God the Creator.' (*Adver. Mar. lib. v., cap. 16, p. 473.*) Leo I., after citing Luke xxiv. against some who maintained that Christ was a spirit, further quotes the words, 'Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is 'come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that dissolveth 'or doeth away with (*solvit*) Jesus is not of God, and this is 'antichrist' (1 John iv. 3), and remarks—'But what is to 'dissolve Jesus except to disjoin the human nature from Him, 'and make void the sacrament of faith for most shameless 'fictions.' (*Epist. x. c. 5, Bib. Mag., Vet. Patr. tom. v., pt. ii., p. 879.*) If Dr Pusey's theory of the real and actual presence of Christ's human nature being present in the consecrated elements, after the manner of a spirit, is not making Jesus void by ignoring His flesh and blood, it is something exceedingly like it. Dr Pusey is evidently of the number of those of whom Calvin speaks thus—'These hyperbolical doctors, who, according to their gross ideas, fabricate an absurd

‘mode of eating and drinking, and transfigure Christ, after
‘divesting Him of His flesh into a phantom.’ (30 12.)

78. The testimony of Augustine on this point is singularly destructive of the theory of these hyperbolical doctors. Thus he says, ‘Christ is to come, according to the angelic testimony, as
‘He was seen to go into heaven, that is, in the same form
‘and substance of flesh; to which indeed He gave immortality, but did not take away its nature. As it respects this
‘form, He is not supposed to be spread abroad everywhere.’ [for instance, capable of being received whole by the mouth of thousands of communicants at the same moment of time.]
‘For we must take heed, that we do not so maintain the
‘divinity of the man as to take away the truth of the body!
‘He is everywhere by that which is God, but He is in heaven
‘by that which is man. . . . Doubt not that Christ is wholly
‘present everywhere as God, and is in the same temple of God
‘as indwelling God, and in some one place of heaven on
‘account of the measure of a true body.’ (21 4.) Nothing could be more fatal to the Paschasian notion than that the real body of Christ, to use the language of Mr Shipley—‘Over
‘and over again, in the smallest portion as in the largest, there
‘must be the same body and blood, the same Christ, whole
‘and undivided.’ (39 12.)

79. Origen yet further shows that Christ is absent in regard to what was seen, but present as Divine; ‘and Jesus indeed, according to what was seen, went, having suffered by
‘the cross; but according to what He really was, He both
‘went, and remained, in the world with the disciples, keeping
‘them in the faith.’ (11 11.) Elsewhere Origen so speaks of the presence of Christ as to imply the real absence of His body. (11 52.) The testimony of Jerome is equally decisive against there being a presence of the body of Christ everywhere. ‘Why said the Lord unto His disciples after His resurrection, “Lo I am with you alway unto the end of the
‘“world;” and now saith, “Me ye have not always.” I
‘think He speaks of His corporal presence, that He would not
‘be with them after His resurrection, as He was now familiarly
‘with them. Of which thing the Apostle makes mention,
‘saying, “Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh,

“yet now henceforth know we Him no more.” (18 55.) This, coupled with what Jerome says respecting the two ways of understanding the blood and flesh of Christ (18 62), makes it quite certain that he must have believed in the real absence of the proper body of Christ until His second coming. Of Jerome, Augustine said, ‘He read all, or in a manner all, the ‘works of them who in both parts of the world wrote ecclesiastical doctrine.’ (*Con. Jul. Pel., lib. i., c. 7, tom. vii., p. 373.*) If Dr Pusey’s assumption were true that Christ invented and contrived for His human nature, both body and soul to be present in the consecrated elements, so as to be received entire at the same moment of time, as well by thousands of communicants as by one, how is it that no ancient Father, no, not even so learned a man as Jerome, should have known of it, but have spoken in fact so expressly of the absence of Christ’s human nature from this world as not to expect its being present, until ‘He shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.’

80. We have yet further to give a portion of Augustine’s testimony concerning the absence of Christ’s human nature from His Church, and the presence of His Divinity with it. He says—

‘Lo, this is the same Jesus. He hath gone up before you, “He shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.” His body is removed, indeed, from your eyes, but God is not separated from your hearts. See Him going up, believe on Him absent, hope for Him coming, but yet, through His secret mercy, feel Him present. For He who ascended into heaven that He might be removed from your eyes, promised unto you, saying, “Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.”’ (21 51.) ‘Dart forth thy faith, and thou hast laid hold. Thy Fathers laid fleshly hold on Him: do thou lay hold with the heart; for Christ being absent is also present. Were He not present He could not even by us be holden. But since that is true which He saith, “Behold I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” He is gone, and yet He is here, is gone back, and yet quits us not; for His body He hath taken with Him into heaven, His majesty He hath not taken away from the world.’ (21 96.) ‘He was speaking of His bodily presence. For, in respect of His majesty, in respect of His providence, in respect of the ineffable and invisible grace, that is in fulfilling that which was spoken by him. “Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” But in respect of the flesh which the Word assumed, in respect that “He was born of the Virgin . . . that He was nailed to the tree

‘ . . . that He was laid in the sepulchre, and that He was manifested in the resurrection. “Ye will not always have” Him “with you.” Why? Because He . . . ascended into heaven, and is not here. For He is there: He sitteth at the right hand of the Father: and yet is here, for the presence of His majesty hath not quitted us.’ (21 97.) ‘Christ left the world by corporal departure, He went His way unto the Father by ascension of the manhood, yet quitted not the world by governance of His presence. He was about to go to the right hand of the Father, whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead, once more in bodily presence, according to the rule of faith and sound doctrine; for by spiritual presence He was we know to be with them after His ascension, and with His whole Church in this world, “even unto the end of the world.” . . . Those whom He had already begun to keep by bodily presence, and whom He was about to leave by bodily absence, that He might, together with the Father, keep them by spiritual presence.’ (21 102.) ‘The Lord was known to them, and after He was known, He never appeared. He departed from them in body, whilst He was held by faith. For the Lord absented Himself in body from the whole Church, and ascended into heaven that faith might be established.’ (21 119.)

81. We could not have a direct and formal denial of the heresy of Paschasius for this plain reason: it was unheard of until 500 years after the time of Augustine. Is it conceivable that Augustine could have written thus, if in his mind he believed that the human nature of Christ was present in the consecrated elements? Had he known and believed such a doctrine, it is incredible that he could in effect so plainly ignore it. In one of the above extracts we have by anticipation a formal denial of what Paschasius taught and what Dr Pusey now believes. Paschasius says, ‘Certainly nothing but the flesh and blood of Christ must be believed after consecration. . . . And that I may speak more wonderfully, plainly no other than was born of Mary, and suffered on the cross, and rose from the sepulchre.’ (33 1, 2.) Augustine says, ‘But in respect of the flesh which the Word assumed in respect that He was born of the virgin, was nailed to the tree, that He was laid in the sepulchre, and that He was manifested in the resurrection “ye will not always have” Him “with you.” Why? Because He ascended into heaven, and is not here.’ (21 97.) That which Paschasius believed to be really present in this world, and which Dr Pusey now believes, the illustrious and great minded Catholic, Augus-

tine, believed to be really absent. Dr Pusey employs the phrase, 'spiritual presence of Christ,' so as to include the real presence of His body and blood. Augustine, in one of the above extracts employs the same phrase as expressive of the real absence of the body of Christ. Bede 300 years after the time of Augustine reiterated the same sentiments. (24 2, 3, 21.)

82. It should be observed, that the words 'spiritual' and 'spiritually,' as employed by the early Fathers in relation to Christ and what is signified in the sacrament of the Eucharist, imply the absence, or are exclusive, of His real body and blood, whereas Dr Pusey and Roman Catholics generally, so employ the words that, when it suits their purpose, they consider them to be inclusive of Christ's real body and blood. We shall now more especially examine Dr Pusey's teaching on this point in the light of patristic testimony.

83. Dr Pusey instructs his readers that 'the Fathers use 'undoubtedly the word which we have in our services, "spiritually" opposed as it is, not to really and sacramentally, 'but to physically and carnally,' and then cites several Fathers to illustrate his assertion. (35 21.) With all this we perfectly agree. But what does he mean by the word 'sacramentally?' We have seen that to this he attaches not a catholic and primitive meaning, but a private and modern one. And the meaning which he attaches to this word, determines the meaning which he attaches to the word 'really.' He does not mean a real spiritual presence, which is the doctrine of the Fathers and of the Reformers, Zwingle not excepted (secs. 38-41 above), but a real spiritual presence of Christ's human body; that is, the real presence of that very body which was born of the blessed Mary and rose from the dead, and that as the same body which came, as he teaches, after the manner of a spirit through the membranous substance of the blessed Mary's womb, and through the solid block of stone, without in either case displacing any parts, so still after the manner of a spirit the very same body is present in each consecrated portion of bread and wine as received by every communicant—whether saint or sinner. We maintain that 'the Fathers use undoubtedly the word

“which we have in our services, “spiritually” as opposed to “really” and “sacramentally,”’ as these two last defining words are understood by Dr Pusey. Thus by leaving out the *negative* the statement is brought within the precincts of exact truth. It is certain that the Fathers here cited (35 21) no more than our services use the word ‘spiritually’ in such a sense as to admit of Dr Pusey’s teaching on the Real Presence. But as a sermon only afforded limited space for such evidence, it may well be asked, is there not more evidence given in the volume containing seven hundred pages of notes to the sermon? From the sermon, we are referred to the note distinguished by the letter P. But here, instead of finding any additional evidence, we are informed, ‘The passages in which ‘Fathers speak of the Holy Eucharist as “spiritual” food ‘will be given under the names of those Fathers in note S.’ (p. 162). We are not even told the names of the Fathers, but by the note S we are referred to about four hundred pages of extracts from the Fathers, where we find very little on the subject, and what there is, is against, and not for Dr Pusey’s doctrine. We are shut up then to the citations which are made in the sermon, but these, with one exception, which we shall notice presently, are commonly adduced by learned Protestant divines against the very doctrine which he holds. It was for this reason perhaps that he told his readers as a necessary caution that although they use the word ‘spiritually,’ as in our services, they do not really contradict his doctrine on the Real Presence.

84. How fatally the Fathers generally use the words ‘spiritual’ and ‘spiritually’ against this doctrine it remains now to be shown. They repudiate, as we have seen, with abhorrence the very idea of Christ’s human body, existing, acting, or being present after the manner of a spirit (secs. 45-49). When they use the words ‘spiritual’ and ‘spiritually,’ in regard to a participation of Christ, whether in the Lord’s Supper or out of it, we are not to conceive that they thereby mean the reception of the real and actual body which our Lord took from the blessed Mary, as Dr Pusey represents. Their use of the words ‘spiritual’ and ‘spiritually,’ as we shall now show from their writings, forbid any such conception. The Fathers,

as was suitable, whenever they could, took their defining words in theology from Scripture. Thus Christ is defined as a spiritual Rock, not as meaning that His body and blood were present in the rock after the manner of a spirit. It is true Ambrose says, 'In that sacrament Christ is, because it 'is Christ's body; it is not therefore bodily food, but spiritual. 'Whence, also, the Apostle says of its type, "Our fathers "ate a spiritual food and drank a spiritual drink," for the 'body of God is a spiritual body: the body of Christ is a body 'of a Divine Spirit; for Christ is a Spirit' (35 21). As thus cited by Dr Pusey, there would seem to be some semblance of his doctrine. Paschasius had made the best use he could of this passage; how well he was answered by Bertram, as well as Dr Pusey, by anticipation, may be seen in chapter viii. 11-16. It is worthy of notice that out of the hundreds of tomes of Patristic records, Paschasius and his disciples can only adduce this scrap where their phraseology can be found which seems in favour of the body of Christ, which was born of Mary and crucified, being really in the consecrated bread after the manner of a spirit. But had that been really what Ambrose meant, then, contrary to other Fathers, which we have just noticed, we find him speaking of the body of Christ in the same style in which the heretical Marcionites and Valentinians spoke. Nothing could have been more abhorrent to the mind of Ambrose. We are certain, however, from the context in which the passage occurs, that he did not mean by the phrase 'the body of Christ is a body of a Divine Spirit,' the real body in which Christ was crucified. For what proofs does he give that Christ's body is spiritual? Not any such as those given by Dr Pusey, but essentially different therefrom, for he says, 'Since Christ is Spirit, as we read, "The Spirit before "our face is Christ the Lord" (Lamen. iv. 20). Lastly, that 'food strengtheneth our heart, and that drink "maketh glad "the heart of man," as the Prophet recorded.' (17 15.)

85. It is of the utmost importance that the reader should understand Dr Pusey's doctrine on the point we are now discussing, and the nature of the evidence to be adduced against it. He believes that the elements become by consecration

really, truly, and spiritually—that is, after the manner of a spirit—Christ's body and blood. (35 1.)

'Christ hath said, "This is my body." He saith not by what mode. We believe what He, the Truth, saith. Truth cannot lie. . . . We receive without doubting, that our Lord, in His spiritual body, passed on the morning of His resurrection through the sealed tomb. For the angels rolled away the stone to show that He was risen. He passed through the closed doors, so that the disciples thought that "it was a spirit," as He had passed before, *illusa virginitate*, through the doors of the Virgin's womb.' (35 11.) I believe that in the Holy Eucharist the body and blood of Christ . . . are verily and indeed present "under the form of bread and wine," and that "where His body is *there* is Christ." (35 61.) Man placeth his hand on the oblations with the words of consecration, "This is my body," "This is my blood." . . . But so He has said, "This is my body," "This is my blood," and by His saying He effects what He said. It is a great mystery of His love that being for ever in His natural mode of existence in His human body at the right hand of God, He should so "delight to be among the sons of men," that He should invent, so to speak, another mode of existence, in order to be with us, to be with each one of us, as if He were with none besides. It is a miracle, the most marvellous of miracles. . . . But by a Divine virtue He raises His body above the condition of a body, and gives it a spiritual mode of existence.' (35 67.) 'But then the same body which is locally at the right hand of God is supra-locally, under a different mode of existence, present with us, really, truly, substantially, though spiritually. And since His body is there, there must His Soul be also, there also His Divinity.' (35 68.)

86. This doctrine of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements is believed by Dr Pusey, and the followers of Paschasius generally, to be so necessarily connected with the elements, that whoever receive them (according to the Roman Catholics, even brute beasts) really and actually receive Christ's body and blood, and with them also His Soul and Divinity. As the Fathers never believed this doctrine, and as it was unknown in the Christian Church for more than 800 years, the evidence to be adduced of course must be indirect. We have already shown that the Fathers do not teach that a sacrament or mystery, as understood by them, is, or really contains, the thing of which it is a sacrament or mystery, and that the sacrament or mystery is one thing and that of which it is a sacrament or mystery is another. We have now to show that, according to the teaching of the Fathers, the sacrament or

mystery in the Lord's Supper may be received without receiving the thing of which it is a sacrament or mystery. This kind of reception is said to be in sacrament or mystery only, that is, sacramentally or mystically only. The proper reception in the Lord's Supper is not only to receive in this way, but also really and spiritually, that is, not only the signs but also the things signified. Roman Catholics admit that there are three ways in which Christ can be received, namely, spiritually out of the sacrament, spiritually in the sacrament, and in the sacrament or sacramentally only. This is taught in the *Corpus Juris Canonici Dec. III. pars De Con. Distinct. ii.*, cc. 46, 47, 59, 64, 68. Their doctrine on this point is well expressed by Gardiner, one of their bishops, in controversy with Cranmer. Thus he says,

'In the Catholic teaching all the doctrine of eating Christ is concluded 'in two manner of eatings : one in the visible sacrament sacramental, 'another spiritual without the sacrament. And because, in the eating 'of the visible sacrament, St Paul speaketh of unworthy, the same 'true teaching, to open the matter more clearly according to Scripture, 'noteth unto us three manner of eatings, one spiritual only, which 'only good men do, feeding in faith without the visible sacrament. 'Another is both spiritual and sacramental, which also good men only 'do, receiving the visible sacrament with a true, sincere, charitable, 'faith. The third manner of eating is sacramental only, which (after 'St Paul) evil men do unworthily, and therefore have judgment and 'condemnation, and be guilty of our Lord's body.'—(*Works of Cranmer*, vol. i., p. 201.)

We accept this as a true account, as Cranmer did. (31 8.)

87. The reader must bear in mind, respecting which there can be no mistake, that, according to the teaching of Roman Catholics, Dr Pusey, Dr Hamilton, the late Bishop of Salisbury, and the school of Pасhasius generally, the real body and blood of Christ, or the thing signified by the sacrament or mystery, without defining specifically what they are, are always received in the sacrament, or in the mystery. We have now to show that such teaching is quite alien to the Fathers. We maintain with Zwingle that the things signified ought to be received in the sacrament sacramentally, and that this is the proper sacramental eating; but as there are some unworthy partakers who do not with the signs receive the things signified, these are said to eat sacramentally improperly. (29 16.)

88. We positively have no proof whatever of the Fathers teaching that the real body of Christ, which was born of Mary, is received in the consecrated bread after the manner of a spirit; but we have most ample and conclusive proof that Christ is spiritual food and can be received by the spiritually-minded only, whether in or out of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

89. On this point the Fathers speak to the following effect:—Cyril says, 'They, not hearing spiritually' (15 12), of course received no good by their hearing. Ambrose says, 'There is a spiritual manna, that is the rain of spiritual wisdom.' (17 4.) Jerome speaks of 'The teacher of the Church who makes spiritual bread . . . and pollutes the bread of doctrines.' (18 48.) Augustine commenting on the words, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth,' gives Christ's meaning as if He had said, 'Understand spiritually what I have said, I have commended unto you a certain sacrament, spiritually understood it will quicken, although it is needful that this be visibly celebrated, yet it must be spiritually understood.' (21 59.) He says, 'many ate there (in the wilderness) and died not. Why? Because that visible food they spiritually understood, spiritually hungered after, spiritually tasted that they might be spiritually filled. For we, too, at this day, do receive visible food, but the sacrament is one, the virtue of the sacrament is another.' (21 74, 75.) According to this plain teaching of Augustine, to eat Christ spiritually is not to eat the body of Christ present after the manner of a spirit, whether in the Jewish or Christian sacraments, but with the sacraments to receive the things signified as well as the signs, viz., the virtue of the sacraments. Again, he says, 'Eat ye spiritually the heavenly bread, bring innocence to the altar.' (21 76.) The eating of the living bread, whether as represented by the manna or consecrated bread, could only be eaten inwardly, not outwardly, with the heart, not with the teeth. (21 78.) That the flesh of Christ could not be received by the mouth, according to the teaching of Augustine, is certain, for he so explains the words, 'The flesh profiteth nothing,' as to show that, in his day, no Catholic could maintain that Christ's real flesh could be eaten, Our Lord's flesh was purely

human, and, for our sakes, he condescended to tabernacle therein ; and we may well ask what profit would there be in eating that any more than any other human flesh. How much we have profited, and may yet profit, from what He did for our sake in our flesh is another and very different question ; and this is the view which Augustine takes of it. Hence he says, ‘ Mark what the flesh had, not what it was. The flesh was a ‘ vessel.’ This he illustrates as follows:—‘ The Apostles were ‘ sent ; did their flesh nothing profit us ? If the flesh of ‘ Apostles profited us, can it be that the flesh of the Lord profiteth nothing ? For whence came to us the sound of the ‘ Word but by the voice of the flesh ? Whence the pen of the ‘ writer, whence the writing ? These all are works of the flesh, ‘ but by the Spirit actuating, as one may say, His organ, “ It ‘ “ is the Spirit,” then, “ that quickeneth ; the flesh profiteth ‘ “ nothing,” so as those Jews understood the flesh, not so give ‘ I my flesh to be eaten.’ (21 88.) That the words of Christ respecting eating His flesh are to be taken spiritually and not literally, is plain from the circumstance that he calls them ‘ mystical words ’ (21 86), and plainly teaches that they are to be understood figuratively, (21 13) Christ’s words, as well as His sacraments, although they are said to be spirit and life, but only those receive their spirit and life who spiritually approach and understand them. (21 89.) When Augustine speaks of the spiritual presence of Christ, it is very frequently in connection with the real absence of His body, as we have already noticed. (Secs. 75-81.)

90. Chrysostom teaches as plain as language can teach that Christ’s words, in the sixth of St John, respecting eating His flesh and drinking His blood, must be understood not literally, but spiritually and mystically. (22 14.) It is important to notice that the word ‘ mystical ’ is used by the Fathers in exactly the opposite sense of the word ‘ literal.’

91. Theodoret, when speaking of Christ being ‘ sacrificed ‘ unsacrificed, and divided undivided, and expended remaining ‘ unspent’ (23 13), can only be understood spiritually in the same manner in which Augustine speaks of the Church being consumed in the elements, and yet not consumed—‘ Lo the ‘ body is received, it is eaten, it is consumed. Is the Church

'of Christ consumed? Are the members of Christ consumed? 'Never.' (21 127.) Theodoret, in his mystical interpretation of Solomon's Song, speaks of devout communicants at the mystical or sacramental time as receiving 'the members of the 'Bridegroom.' (23 15, 17.)

92. These instances may serve as an illustration of the manner in which the Fathers use the words 'spiritual' and 'spiritually' as applying only to what can be received spiritually, and not to material elements which are supposed to have been made, or to have become Christ's spiritual body, or His body after the manner of a spirit, and which can be really received by the wicked, though not spiritually received. The Fathers also plainly teach that unworthy communicants do not receive what is signified by the consecrated elements, than which nothing could be more fatal to the Paschasian doctrine, that whoever receive these signs therewith also receive the things signified.

93. Origen very definitely states—"No wicked man is able 'to eat Him who became flesh and true food. For if it were 'possible that any one living in sin could eat Him who became 'flesh, being the Word and living bread, it would not have 'been written "every one who eateth this bread shall live for "'ever."' (11 5.) In an exposition of the Christian Passover, he says, the worldly 'neither celebrate the Passover with 'Jesus nor receive the cup of blessing from Him.' (11 9.) He also states—"But he who shall have tasted the bread 'which cometh down from heaven shall not die, but remain to 'life eternal.' (11 33.) It is needless to state that unbelievers do not receive this Bread, although they may hear the words which proclaim it, or eat the sacrament which represents it. He also says—"The true disciples of Christ feast on the 'secret and invisible, unleavened bread of sincerity and truth; 'they eat also the Passover Christ sacrificed for us, who said, "'Except ye eat my flesh ye have no life in you."' (11 6.) This could not be plainer. Speaking of the food of the sacrament, he says—"This holy food is not the common food of all, 'nor is it of any unworthy person, but of the saints,' Then he goes on to remark—"How much more rightly and deservedly may we say this also concerning the Word of

God,' meaning Christ Himself revealed in the Scriptures. (11 31.)

94. Ambrose, speaking in the person of Christ, says, 'yet 'if he have received of my bread, he shall live for ever. For 'he receiveth who proveth himself, but whoever receiveth shall 'not die the sinner's death, for this bread is the remission of 'sins.' (17 3.) 'They who did eat that bread, are dead, but 'he who shall eat this bread shall live for ever.' (17 4.) 'For he who has received the food of Christ, shall never 'hunger.' 17 11.) We are certain, from such statements as these, that if the precious realities of the sacramental signs are really received, they cannot at the moment be received in vain, or to judgment, and therefore justly conclude that the wicked cannot receive them.

95. Jerome speaks of Christ as 'the bread of the just, yea, 'of those who believe, of those who are hungry.' (18 29.) Still more to the point, he says, 'Since they are not holy in 'body and spirit, they neither eat the flesh of Jesus, nor drink 'His blood, whereof Himself says, "Whoso eateth my flesh, ' "and drinketh my blood hath eternal life."' (18 26.) We may be quite certain, that in the judgment of this learned Father, the wicked could not really either eat Christ's flesh or drink His blood.

96. That the wicked only eat the body of Christ in the sacrament or sacramentally, and not that which is signified by the sacrament, is most certain from the plain and unmistakeable teaching of the great Augustine. Dr Pusey, in order to bring Augustine's teaching into harmony with his doctrine of the real presence converts the post-Reformation definition of a sacrament which, in our Catechism, is made to consist of two parts, into three, then advances to make the sacrament which Augustine defines as being one also into three parts. We shall now examine his handy-work, and show how he accomplishes this marvellous performance. He admits that believers only can receive the virtue or grace of the sacrament, while, at the same time, he maintains that the wicked, with the outward signs, receive that of which they are the signs. Thus he says, 'In the Holy Eucharist, the *grace* of the sacrament 'comes through the right reception of *the thing of the sacra-*

‘*ment*, or “the inward part or thing signified.” To the faithful recipient, the “thing signified,” and the “grace” of the sacrament, come in one. In receiving the outward part, we receive the inward, the body and blood; in receiving the inward part, we, if faithful, receive “the grace.”’ (*The Real Presence*, &c., pp. 163, 164.) Archdeacon Denison also speaks of the reality of the sacrament, and of the grace or virtue of it, as if there were two separate and independent things, and as if the reality could be received without the grace or virtue. (36 5.)

97. Here Dr Pusey and his oldest and most zealous pupil make a concession utterly fatal to their doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ’s body and blood in the consecrated elements. They admit that a portion of the inward part of the sacrament can only be received by the faithful. Dr Pusey, the master, goes so far as to inform us what he believes to be the distinction between the body and blood of the sacrament, and its grace or virtue, which he rests upon a groundless assumption, and it is important to notice with what courage and seeming assurance he maintains it. He takes it for granted that it is the doctrine of the Church of England, of the ancient Church, and of Augustine. He only attempts to prove, however, that it is the doctrine of the Church of England, and he does so by apparently falsifying the plain language of the Church Catechism, or by making numskulls of its framers. The Catechism states, that there are only two sacraments ordained by Christ, that is, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Then a sacrament is said to consist of two parts, viz., the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace. It is needless to say that this definition was intended to apply to both sacraments. But Dr Pusey maintains from the same Catechism, that in the sacrament of the Supper there are three parts, viz., 1st, the outward visible sign; 2dly, the inward part or thing signified, and, 3dly, the inward spiritual grace. That there may be no mistake as to how he construes the Catechism, his own words shall be given. On the two questions, ‘What is the inward part or thing signified?’ and what ‘are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?’ he remarks, ‘now of these two, the last plainly corresponds with

'the question as to Baptism, "What is the grace of the sacrament." The first question inquires not into the "grace" but into "the *thing* signified." It is no longer "What is "the inward and spiritual *grace*?" but first, "What is the 'inward *part* or *thing* signified?" And after this, then 'follows the question as to the *grace*." (*Ibid.* p. 163.) Dr Pusey, notwithstanding the plain statement of the Catechism, viz., that a sacrament, whether that of Baptism, or that of the Supper, consists of two parts, and two parts only, so explains the statement as to make it appear that the sacrament of the Eucharist consists of three parts, it having an inward part or thing signified, the sacrament of Baptism having no such part. The Reformers, one and all, regarded the grace or virtue of the sacrament as being identical with the thing signified, and so did their opponents the Roman Catholics. How Calvin and Jewel spoke may be seen (30 25 ; 32 6.) Hooker most certainly regarded the grace of the sacrament and its reality as being one and the same thing. (*Eccle. Pol.* bk. v. 67.) The school doctors of the Romish Church defined a sacrament to be a visible sign of an invisible grace. (See ch. x. 16.) Dr Pusey argues, 'the inward part of the Lord's Supper is not 'merely a grace; it is more; it is the body and blood of 'Christ.' (*Ibid.* p. 163.) Here he plainly regards the grace as a portion of the inward part of the sacrament, as well as the actual and real body and blood of Christ. But he also strenuously maintains elsewhere, which we have considered (ch. x. 30-46), that whoever receives the outward sign, that is, the consecrated bread, receives in or with it 'the inward part,' which he holds is actually *in* the visible sign. To be consistent, one would suppose that he would hold that the grace must necessarily be received after the same manner. Nothing of the kind. He says, 'In receiving the outward part, we (and as he teaches 'elsewhere, all communicants of whatever kind) receive the 'inward, the body and blood; in receiving the inward part, 'we, if *faithful*, receive the grace.' (*Ibid.* p. 164.)

98. But this contradictory account of the sacraments which he attributes to the framers of the catechism he represents as a deviation, and finds it on a like deviation which he curiously ascribes to Augustine. He says—

‘The framers of the Catechism maintained the correspondence of the two sacraments, as far as the case admitted. They deviated, just as the ancient Church and St Augustine, with whom they were so familiar, deviated. It has been noticed that the division as to the two sacraments in St Augustine does not exactly agree. There is an outward part and an inward ; but the inward part of Baptism is the grace of Baptism ; the inward part of the Lord’s Supper is not merely a grace—it is more : it is the body and blood of Christ. In the Holy Eucharist, the *grace* of the sacrament comes through the right reception of the *reality of the sacrament*, or “the inward part or thing signified.” To the faithful recipient, the “thing signified” and the *grace* of the sacrament come in one. In its largest sense a sacrament is a “sign of a sacred thing.” There is the visible sign, and there is that which is invisible. It is plainly right and instructive to point out the correspondence between the sacraments as far as it exists ; but where the correspondence of the things ceases, there the correspondence of the language must cease. The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper has something more than the sacrament of Baptism. Notwithstanding the division which lies in the very nature of a sacrament, that there is that which is seen and that which is not seen, St Augustine was obliged, in regard to the Lord’s Supper, to make a further sub-division. There is (1), “The sacrament, the bread, and “wine ;” (2), The reality or substance of the sacrament, “the body “and blood of Christ ;” (3), The grace of the sacrament, “the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of “Christ.” It is idle to object that “this is not a logical division.” The mysteries of God’s gifts exceed our logic, as they do our capacities.’—(*Ibid.* pp. 163, 164.)

99. This is an unaccountable utterance, but we forbear to characterise it further. He would give his readers to understand that the interpretation which he most unwarrantably fixes upon the catechism is in accordance with the teaching of Augustine. Nothing could be further from the truth. If we take the definition of a sacrament in the catechism as equally applicable to that of Baptism, and that of the Supper, as we ought to do, even then there is an important verbal difference between the definition of a sacrament there given and the one given by Augustine. Dr Pusey, in the above extract, says, ‘In its largest sense a sacrament is a “sign of a sacred ‘thing.”’ But this is the exact definition which Augustine gives, whether in its largest or smallest sense, as is shewn, ch. x. 13, 14. He never defines a sacrament to be other than an outward sign.

100. At present we are more concerned with Augustine

than the Catechism ; but if it must be interpreted from Augustine, as Dr Pusey assumes, then it can be demonstrated that his interpretation is inadmissible. We ask, is it a fact that Augustine considered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to have a part more than the sacrament of Baptism, viz., the reality or substance of the sacrament, the sacrament of Baptism having two parts only, not having the reality, or thing signified ? The answer is, it is not a fact, but a fiction awkwardly ascribed to Augustine by Dr Pusey, and, as a fiction, cannot admit of proof, he has not attempted to give any. The simple fact is this, that with Augustine the thing, reality, or substance of the sacrament, and the grace or virtue of it, express exactly one and the same thing, and he sometimes speaks of the thing or reality of the sacrament of Baptism and of the grace or virtue of the sacrament of the Eucharist, meaning thereby the reality of the sacrament, and not an influence which may or may not be received with the reality according to the worthiness or unworthiness of the receiver, which is what Dr Pusey wishes to impose upon his readers.

101. Augustine, explaining the nature of sacraments to Bishop Boniface, specially referring to Baptism and the Eucharist, speaks of sacraments as having 'certain resemblances to the things or realities of which they are the sacraments ; and as receiving, for the most part, the names even of the things themselves.' Of the Eucharist he says, 'The sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ ; the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ.' Speaking of Baptism, he says, 'The sacrament of so great a thing [burial with Christ] he called by no other name than that of the thing itself.' (21 1-3.) What more certain than that in the mind of Augustine there was the reality of the sacrament of Baptism as well as the reality of the sacrament of the Eucharist. The same sentiments are repeated in his discourse on catechizing. (21 26.) This is cited with other definitions of the nature of a sacrament as given by Augustine in the *Corpus Juris Canonici* of the Roman Church, especially the following :—'But if the man is evil, God by him performs a visible form of sacrament, but He Himself gives the invisible grace.' Here assuredly the invisible grace is the

reality or thing signified. It is certain Augustine commonly taught that receiving the grace or virtue of a sacrament was receiving the thing or reality signified, and receiving the reality signified was receiving the grace or virtue of the sacrament.

102. Augustine instructs us that 'although the sacraments 'were common, grace, which is the virtue of the sacraments, 'was not common to all.' Again he says, 'The grace itself of 'which these same are the sacraments.' (21 54.) What more plain than that Augustine by the word grace represents the reality of the sacraments? Again, 'For we too at this day 'do receive visible food; but the sacrament is one, the virtue '[which is the grace] of the sacrament, another' (21 75); doubtless meaning the thing signified. Elsewhere evidently alluding to the reality of the sacrament, he calls it the spiritual virtue or virtue of the sacrament. (21 77, 78.) How Bede, Bertram, and Rabanus Maurus followed the example of Augustine, and plainly taught that the grace or virtue of the sacrament was the thing signified or reality, and not anything additional, may be seen. (24 12, 24. 25 47. 26 17, 21, 22.) Paschasius, without doubt, rightly understood the orthodox of his day when they spoke of the virtue or grace of the sacrament, including therein the reality or thing signified, and not, as Dr Pusey would now teach his disciples, something in addition to and more efficacious than the reality. Hence he took offence at the orthodox phraseology of Augustine, and complained thus—'I know not how the real death of Christ 'is announced among those wishing to applaud and imagine, 'as if there were a certain virtue only of the flesh and blood 'in that sacrament, so that the Lord deceives, and there is not 'His real flesh nor real blood when the Truth Himself said, '“This is my body.” . . . Therefore He did not say, when 'He brake and gave to them the bread, that is, in this mystery 'there is either a certain virtue or a figure of my body, but 'He said unfeignedly, “This is my body.” (33 28.) Again he says, 'Whence I marvel why some wish now to say that 'there is not the reality of the flesh or of the body of Christ 'in the thing, but that in the sacrament there is a certain 'virtue of the flesh and not the flesh: that there is the virtue 'of the blood, and not the blood.' (33 29.)

103. Augustine most certainly defined the sacrament of the Eucharist in no way different from any other sacrament. Thus he says, 'There is a sacrament in any celebration when a remembrance is so made of a thing done, that something also be understood to be signified which must be spiritually understood.' (21 7.) Baptism and the Eucharist, which we are accustomed to speak of as two sacraments, the early Church spoke of as four. Isidore, as cited by Bertram, applies this very definition of Augustine to four sacraments. He says, 'The sacraments are Baptism and Chrism, the Body and Blood. These are called sacraments, because under the covering of bodily things [viz., water, oil, bread, and wine] the power of God secretly worketh the salvation which lieth in them. Whence from their hidden and sacred virtues they are called sacraments.' (25 24, 25.) Here most certainly Isidore considered Augustine's definition of a sacrament as equally applicable to any one of the four enumerated, and he speaks alike of 'the hidden and sacred virtues' of all, affirming nothing more of the sacraments of the Eucharist than of the sacraments of Baptism. Bertram, of course, approved of this, and cited it as a valuable piece of evidence against Paschasius, as we do against his disciple Dr Pusey. Rabanus Maurus, for the benefit of his clergy, cited the same definition of Augustine. (26 29. See also ch. viii. 67.)

104. Augustine, as cited by Gratian in the *Corpus Juris Canonici* of the Roman Church, says, 'For as we now receive the likeness of His death in Baptism, so we may also receive the likeness of His flesh and blood, so that the reality may not be wanting in the sacrament.' (*De consecrat. Dist. ii. c. 72, Tom. i. col. 1952.*) These may not be the very words of Augustine, but they are his real sentiments, and we learn from them, as well as from the other evidence adduced, how seriously Dr Pusey has misrepresented the teaching of Augustine on the doctrine of the sacraments.

105. Dr Pusey himself, in his 'Extracts from some Writers in our later English Church on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,' intended to support the doctrine which he maintained in his sermon entitled 'The Holy Eucharist, a comfort to the penitent,' cites the following from Bishop Ridley :—

‘I say and believe that there is not only a signification of Christ’s body and blood set forth by the sacrament, but also that therewith is given to the godly and faithful the grace of Christ’s body—that is, the food of life and immortality, and this I hold with Cyprian. I say also, with St Augustine, that we eat life and we drink life; with Emissene, that we feel the Lord to be present in grace; with Cyril, the virtue of the very flesh of Christ, life and grace of His body; with Ambrose, the body by grace; grace and invisible verity, grace and society of the members of Christ’s body with Augustine. Finally, with Bertram (who was the last of all these) I confess that Christ’s body is in the sacrament in this respect; namely, as he writeth, because there is in it the Spirit of Christ—that is, the power of the Word of God, which not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it.’

106. But Dr Pusey, by thus inventing this essential difference between the sacrament of Baptism and the sacrament of the Eucharist, contradicts the plain teaching of the Fathers who make little or no distinction between them, and consider the body and blood of Christ to be as much in the one sacrament as in the other. Origen, speaking of the Word of God, (a title which he applies to the Lord Jesus and to the truth of Scripture) represents it as being to some the baptism of blood, to others the baptism of water. How it is a baptism of blood he shows us. It is blood on account of that, ‘Except ye drink my blood ye have no life in you.’ (11 1.) Rufinus, in one of the most valuable ancient expositions of the creed the Church possesses, speaks of Baptism in a twofold aspect, and as if it included the sacrament of the Eucharist. Thus he represents the blood and water which flowed from the Redeemer’s side as being ‘understood to figure the twofold grace of Baptism—one which was given by the water of Baptism, the other which is sought by the mystery of the shedding of blood, for both are named baptism.’ (20 6.) Elsewhere Origen says, ‘For in the wine of this blood, that is, in the laver of regeneration, the Church is washed by Christ. For we are buried by baptism into death, and in His blood, that is, we are baptized into His death.’ (11 20.)

107. Basil speaks of those who by sinning after they have put on Christ by Baptism, as trampling upon His body and counting the blood of the covenant as an unholy thing. (16 6.) Jerome states that the Eunuch ‘was baptized in the blood of

‘the Saviour.’ (18 24.) Ruffinus says—‘In the wine of this blood, that is, in the laver of regeneration, the Church is washed by Christ, for we are buried with Him by baptism in death, and in His blood, that is, we are baptized in His death.’ (20 1.) Chrysostom teaches that in Baptism we are made ‘of Christ’s flesh and of His bones,’ and remarks, ‘Like as He was begotten of the Holy Ghost, so also are we begotten in the laver.’ (22 30.) Theodoret says, ‘For through all-holy Baptism the true illumination is bestowed on those who approach it, and the tasting of the life-giving food plainly shows the goodness of the Saviour. For what so clearly exhibits His love for man as the cross, and the passion, and the death undergone for our sakes, and His being at once *the food and the well of His own sheep*.’ (23 11.) He further speaks of a double stream of mysteries as flowing from the side of Christ. ‘One cleanses us and frees us from sins, the other nourishes and refreshes, and makes us fruitful,’ doubtless meaning Baptism and the Eucharist. (23 23.) Again on the words, ‘For we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones,’ he remarks, ‘For as Eve was formed from Adam, so we from the Lord Christ; for we are buried with Him in baptism, and rise again with Him, and eat His body and drink His blood.’ (23 31.) Augustine affirms the same presence of Christ in the sacrament of Baptism as in the sacrament of the Eucharist.’ (21 97.) Fulgentius states, ‘I think that my argument is confirmed by the sermon of the celebrated Doctor Augustine; and that there is no room for any one to doubt that each one of the faithful is there made a partaker of the body and blood of the Lord, when in Baptism he is made a member of the body of Christ.’ (21 138.) Bede also uttered exactly the same sentiments. (24 27.) According to the undoubted teaching of the Fathers, the body and blood of Christ were as much received in the sacrament of Baptism as in that of the Eucharist. For more upon this subject see chapter vii. 44, 45.

108. Beyond all question Augustine and other Fathers so spoke of the reality of the sacrament and its grace as to show that in their minds there was no distinction between them, and that one in fact could not be received without the other.

That in the mind of Augustine the wicked could neither partake of the reality of the sacrament nor its grace is plain from the extracts which here follow, given in the order in which they occur in Augustine's writings, and as they are placed in our Catena :—

'The flesh of Christ is the life of the faithful, if they neglect not to be His body ; let them become the body of Christ, if they wish to live by the Spirit of Christ, by which none liveth but the body of Christ. He receiveth the food of life and drinketh the cup of eternity who dwelleth in Christ, and whose Indweller Christ is. For he who differs from Christ neither eateth His flesh nor drinketh His blood, although he daily indiscriminately receive the sacrament of so great a thing.' (21 20, 21.) 'Catholics have eaten the body of Christ not in the sacrament (sacramentally) only, but in reality, being placed in that very body of His of which the Apostle saith, "We being many are one bread." (21 32.) 'He, therefore, who is in the unity of that body, *i.e.*, in the campages (structure) of the members of Christ, of which body the faithful communicants are wont to receive the sacrament from the altar, he is truly to be said to eat the body of Christ, and drink the blood of Christ.' (21 33.) 'The wicked are not to be said to eat the body of Christ, because neither are they to be accounted among the members of Christ. For, not to mention other things, they cannot at the same time be both the members of Christ and members of a harlot. Lastly, He Himself, when He saith, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him," sheweth what it is to eat the body of Christ and drink His blood, not as to the sacrament only, but in reality.' (21 34.) 'He that shall have had unrighteousness wilfully, shall not be able to eat righteousness. For righteousness is bread. Who is bread? "I am the living bread which came down from heaven;" Himself is the bread of our heart.' (21 52.) "'This," then, "is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that whoso eateth thereof may not die." But that is in regard of the virtue of the sacrament, not in regard of the visible sacrament ; of him who eateth inwardly, not outwardly ; who eateth in the heart, not who presseth with his teeth.' (21 78.) The sacrament of this thing, that is, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ . . . from the Lord's Table is taken ; by some to life, by some to destruction, but the thing itself of which it is the sacrament, is for every man to life, for none to destruction, whoever shall be partaker thereof.' (21 82.) 'This meat and drink which maketh them by whom it is taken immortal and incorruptible.' (21 83.) 'This, then, it is to eat that meat and drink that drink to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him. And, therefore, he who dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt doth neither spiritually eat His flesh nor drink His blood, albeit carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ ; but

'rather doth unto judgment to himself eat and drink the sacrament of 'so great a thing,' (21 84.) 'The sign which shows that one hath 'eaten and drunk is this, if he indwelleth and is dwelt in, if he inhabiteth and is inhabited, if he cleaveth that he be not abandoned.' (21 86.) 'For we have said, that what the Lord hath given us to 'understand in the eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood, is, 'that we should dwell in Him and He in us. Now we dwell in Him, 'when we are His members, and He dwelleth in us, when we are His 'temple.' (21 89.) 'How He would have us to understand who are 'they that eat His flesh and drink His blood, by this, namely, that 'they dwell in Him and He in them. . . . Let all this, I say, here- 'unto avail us, that we eat not the flesh and blood of Christ only in 'the sacrament, which thing do also many evil men, but even unto the 'participation of the Spirit.' (21 90, 91.) 'And be not offended, yea 'though many in this present time do together with us eat and drink 'temporarily the sacraments, who shall have in the end eternal tor- 'ments.' (21 92.) 'They ate the Bread, the Lord: Judas, the bread 'of the Lord against the Lord: they, Life—he, punishment.' (21 99.) 'But then this shall be, that is, the body and blood of Christ shall be 'each man's life, if what is taken in the sacrament visibly is in the 'reality itself eaten spiritually, drunk spiritually.' (21 108.) 'It is 'not only to receive His body in the sacrament. For many unworthy 'receive. But how is Christ to be eaten? How, He Himself says, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and "I in him." If he abideth in me, and I in him, then he eateth, 'then he drinketh. But he that abideth not in me, nor I in him, 'although he receive the sacrament, he getteth great torment.' (21 139.)

109. Nothing can be more certain, if plain language is capable of conveying truth and common sense, than that Augustine taught that only believing or worthy communicants receive in the sacraments, or sacred signs, the things of which they are the sacraments, and that unbelieving or unworthy communicants receive only the sacraments, and not the things of which they are the sacraments. Dr Pusey has admitted, as we have seen, that the grace or virtue of the sacrament can only be received by the worthy communicant, but it has been proved from Augustine's writings that with him the grace or virtue of the sacrament was the thing or reality which the sacrament signified, and it has been shown that this is admitted almost by all, Roman Catholics not excepted. But notwithstanding this admission, and in the face of all the evidence of Augustine, Dr Pusey plainly asserts, 'Yet S. Augustine's state- 'ments that the wicked do receive the body of Christ, are

‘very distinct. I will only take such as are quite explicit.’ He then gives thirteen statements, and adds,

‘Now, to put together in brief what S. Augustine teaches in these his many works, he tells us explicitly that Judas “received Christ’s body,” received “what the faithful know to be our Ransom;” that “people, “with the mark of the devil, receive the body of Christ;” “the proud rich receive of His body and blood;” “eat Him who is “poor;” that “good and bad together eat and drink the body and “blood of Christ;” that *they* too receive it “who treat the Lord’s “body like any other food;” “do not see any difference between it “and any other meat;” who come to the Lord’s table in hypocrisy; “that the very body and blood of Christ, the only sacrifice for our “salvation, become harmful to those who use it ill,” *i.e.* “who eat “this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily;” that “men “receive it to their own condemnation;” “eat and drink judgment “to themselves, when they eat this flesh and drink this blood;” that “it is no less His body and blood to those who eat and drink “unworthily.”’—(*Real Presence*, &c., pp. 262-265).

110. After this we are treated to several pages of mystification, which is well calculated to perplex the reader unlearned in patristic lore, and convince him, as Romanists and High Anglicans teach, that everything connected with the Lord’s Supper is profoundly mysterious and inexplicable. If some enlightened Protestant, who holds by the Holy Scriptures, should read this mystification, and for the most part accept Dr Pusey’s plausible assumptions, he would be confirmed in the common but erroneous impression that Father contradicts Father, and every Father contradicts himself, the great and acute Augustine not excepted. Dr Pusey himself was conscious that his readers might suppose from his mode of interpreting his words that he really did contradict himself, hence he says, ‘S. Augustine, then, in these places, is not ‘contradicting what he so often says, that the wicked do receive ‘the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament.’—(*Ibid.* 273.) But this statement is well calculated to deceive readers not acquainted with the sacramental phraseology of Augustine, the Fathers generally, and Divines of the Reformation period. For will it be believed that no well-informed and candid Protestant disputes the fact that the wicked do and may receive the body and blood of Christ *in the sacrament*? Zwingle himself holds this (29 5, 9, 10, 16, 22), and also

holds with Augustine that this is the only way in which the wicked do receive the body and blood of Christ. The question is not whether Augustine teaches that the wicked receive the sacraments honoured with the titles which they represent or signify, but do they receive the things signified (to use the language of Augustine) not in the sacrament or sacramentally only but in reality? This Augustine denies, but Dr Pusey affirms, and has recourse to very questionable expedients to adjust the plain teaching of the great Augustine with that of the wretched heretic Paschasius. Before noticing these, the reader's attention will be recalled to a few of the plain statements of Augustine. 'He who differs from Christ, neither eateth His flesh, nor drinketh His blood, although he may daily receive the sacrament of so great a thing to the condemnation of his own presumption.' (21 21.) Here plainly the wicked receive only the sacrament of so great a thing, not the thing itself, which elsewhere Augustine says, 'is for every man to life for none to destruction, whoever shall be a partaker thereof.' (21 82.) In his ablest and most finished work, entitled 'The City of God,' he speaks of some who 'have eaten the body of Christ not in the sacrament or sacramentally only but in reality.' (21 32.) In another part of the same great work he states, 'The wicked are not to be said to eat the body of Christ. . . . He showeth what it is to eat the body of Christ and drink His blood, not as to the sacrament only but in reality.' (21 34.) In another part of his writings he says, 'that we eat not the flesh and blood of Christ only in the sacrament, which thing do also many evil men.' (21 91.) 'If what is taken in the sacrament visibly is in the reality itself eaten spiritually.' (21 108.) 'It is not only to receive His body in the sacrament.' (21 139.)

111. Beyond all question, Augustine here teaches that the body and blood of Christ may be received in the sacrament, or sacred sign, or as to the sacrament or sacred sign, and yet not be really received, but only sacramentally, and that the unworthy communicant receives sacramentally only, but the worthy communicant both sacramentally, and really, and spiritually. How can Dr. Pusey in the face of such testimony as this pretend that Augustine taught that the wicked in

receiving the sacrament or sacred sign really received the thing signified, which, according to Dr. Pusey, is the Body, Soul, and Divinity of Christ. Let us see how he endeavours to accomplish his task. He has plainly told us, 'S. Augustine's statements, that the wicked do receive the body of Christ 'are very distinct.' I will take only 'such as are quite 'explicit.' His own summary of these has already been given (sec. 109 above), an answer to any one of these statements will be in effect an answer to all. As the first appears to be most likely to suit Dr. Pusey's purpose on the unlearned reader, that shall be stated and answered. 'The Lord Himself endureth Judas, a devil, a thief, and His betrayer. He 'allows him to receive, among the innocent disciples, what the 'faithful know to be our ransom.' As a commentary thereupon, Dr. Pusey states, 'Augustine tells us explicitly that 'Judas "received Christ's body," received "what the faithful "know to be our ransom."' "

112. But the question is, how did Judas receive Christ's body? Augustine himself, as we have seen, has given the answer, viz., in the sacrament, as to the sacrament, or sacramentally only, but not the reality or thing signified by the sacrament, pressing the visible sign with his teeth outwardly, but not eating inwardly and spiritually the reality represented by the visible sign. 'The apostles,' says Augustine, 'ate the 'Bread, the Lord, Judas the Lord's bread.' (21 99.) Judas merely ate the visible, material, sacramental bread, but not the Lord, the real spiritual Bread. The material bread used in the sacrament is expressly called by Jerome 'the Lord's bread.' (18 28.) Elsewhere he says, 'Our Lord . . . although not 'ignorant of his thoughts . . . brought him near to that feast 'in which He commended and delivered to His disciples the 'figure of His body and blood.' (21 44.) Doubtless the moral defects of Judas would hinder him from receiving anything more than the figure.

113. In another discourse Augustine speaks of 'our 'Ransom' thus, 'We have heard the true Master, the Divine 'Redeemer, the human Saviour, commending to us our Ransom, His blood. For He spake to us of His body and blood. 'He called His body meat, His blood drink.' Here he alludes

to the sixth of St John, with which the main parts of the discourse is occupied, as may be seen, **21** 107-109, and from which also it may be seen that Augustine could not have conceived that such a character as Judas could have received anything more than the outward emblems of 'our Ransom,' for among other things he says, 'The body and blood of Christ 'shall be each man's life, if what is taken in the sacrament 'visibly is in the reality itself eaten spiritually, drunk 'spiritually.' (**21** 108.) Verily Judas in the judgment of Augustine could be no partaker of 'our Ransom' beyond what was taken in the sacrament visibly, that is the outward signs.

114. Dr. Pusey lays great stress on the fact, which we do not deny, that according to the teaching of Augustine, the sacrament in itself is the same to the unworthy communicant as to the worthy, and was the same to Judas as it was to the other disciples. Relating to this point is one of the thirteen statements of Augustine, cited by Dr. Pusey 'as quite explicit,' and 'very distinct that the wicked do receive the body of 'Christ.' It is as follows, 'As Judas, to whom our Lord offered 'the sop, not by receiving what was evil, but by receiving 'evilly, made room in himself for the devil, so any one who 'unworthily receives the sacrament of the Lord, does not, 'because he is evil himself, cause it to be evil; nor, 'because he receives not unto salvation, has he received 'nothing. For that was no less the body and blood of the 'Lord, to those also to whom the apostle said, "He that "eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh dam- "nation to himself."' (*The Real Presence, etc.*, p. 264.)

115. We have no proof in this statement that the unworthy can receive anything more than 'the sacrament of the 'Lord.' It is true Augustine in the same statement also says, 'For that [meaning bread and cup, words not used by the 'Fathers in that connection before the uninitiated] was no less '(nevertheless) the body and blood of the Lord.' In the use of such language Augustine assuredly meant nothing more than the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, the sign only and not the thing signified. He is using the apostle's language (1 Cor. xi. 29), where, to use the phraseology of Augus-

tine, the apostle called the bread and cup, sacraments of so great things, by no other names than those of the things themselves, viz., body and blood, inasmuch as ‘sacraments for ‘the most part receive the names even of the things themselves.’ (21 3.) Happily so much has been said by Augustine respecting Judas, that he can well be made his own interpreter. In his memorable commentary on the sixth of St John he has made a similar statement to that cited by Dr. Pusey, which, if considered in the light of the immediate commentary, will show how egregiously Augustine has been misrepresented in claiming his great name in maintaining on the side of the Paschasian heresy, that such wicked communicants as Judas, in receiving the consecrated elements, not only receive the sacrament, but with or in it its reality also. The passage is, ‘How many receive from the altar and die, yea, by ‘receiving die. Whence the apostle saith, “Eateth and ““drinketh judgment to himself.” It was not that the sop ‘of the Lord was poison to Judas. And yet he received, and ‘when he received, the enemy entered into him; not that he ‘received an evil thing, but that he, being evil, did in evil- ‘wise receive what was good.’ (21 76.) We have no proof from this statement any more than from the other, that in the judgment of Augustine, Judas received not only the sacrament but the reality of it also. Nay, the immediate commentary, as we shall see, dissipates any such illusion, where we read, ‘Why make ready the teeth and stomach? Believe ‘and thou hast eaten.’ (21 69.) ‘To believe on Him, this is ‘to eat the living Bread. He that believeth eateth. . . . We ‘run not to Christ by walking, but by believing, neither by ‘motion of the body, but by the will of the heart do we draw ‘nigh to Him. (21 72.) He that believeth on me hath me.’ (21 73.) ‘For we too at this day do receive visible food; ‘but the sacrament is one, the virtue of the sacrament ‘another.’ (21 75.)

116. If Augustine meant what he has said, we may be quite certain that in his opinion Judas only received the visible food, the sacrament, the one part, but not the other part, the virtue or reality of it. This admits of still greater confirmation, for in the same commentary he says—

“This, then, is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that
 ‘whoso eateth thereof may not die.’ But this is in regard of the
 ‘virtue of the sacrament, not in regard of the visible sacrament, of
 ‘him who eateth inwardly, not outwardly; who eateth in the heart,
 ‘not who presseth with his teeth.’ (21 78.)

He further states—

‘But in this true meat and drink, that is, the body and blood of
 ‘Christ, it is not so. For both he that taketh it not hath not life, and
 ‘he that taketh it hath life, and that, of course, eternal.’ (21 81.)
 ‘Therefore he who dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwell-
 ‘eth not, without doubt, neither spiritually eats His flesh nor drinks
 ‘His blood, albeit carnally and visibly he presses with his teeth the
 ‘sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; but rather doth unto
 ‘judgment to himself eat and drink the sacrament of so great a
 ‘thing.’ (21 84.)

117. Dr Pusey, by making it appear that Augustine really believed that Judas not only received the consecrated bread, but with it also Christ’s Body, Soul, and Divinity, insults the understanding of the greatest divine of all the Fathers; for how could he, in the face of such plain statements, conceive of Judas as receiving anything more than the sacrament of Christ’s body. It is not to be disputed, however, that the very same sacrament is offered to the unworthy communicant as to the worthy. How this is we learn from Augustine. Thus in the very same commentary, on the sixth of St John, he asks, ‘What meaneth this, “are spirit and life?”’ and answers, ‘Are spiritually to be understood. Hast thou spiri-
 ‘tually understood? “They are spirit and life.” Hast thou
 ‘carnally understood? Even then they are spirit and life,
 ‘but not to thee.’ (21 89.) By Augustine a sacrament was called a visible word, and it like the written or spoken word might be called spirit and life inasmuch as by it spirit and life might be conveyed to the worthy recipient, but to the unworthy would not be spirit and life. Augustine elsewhere has given a special and exhaustive discourse upon this very point, extracts from which will be found, (21 121-124) and which the reader will do well to consult. He there explains the proper mode of understanding certain metaphors in relation to Christ, and shows that they blaspheme who say that such words as ‘rock’ may be Christ in proper signification. To this list Ælfric adds bread. (27 4, 5.) Augustine then goes on to

speak of all the Scriptures and every 'divine word,' and also 'all visible sacraments.' 'All these,' he says, 'both bad and good, have in the Church in common; for these both have the sacraments, and partícipate of them.' He concludes by shewing that although the Word of God and sacraments are in themselves good, yet by being evilly received produce great harm, and that such receivers of the sacraments only eat and drink judgment to themselves. We rightly conclude from this portion of Augustine's teaching that those who unworthily partícipate of the Word of God and sacraments receive nothing more than the letter of the word, nothing more than what is visible in the sacraments.

118. We have yet another portion of evidence to add which will settle the question beyond all dispute. We may be partial in making Augustine his own interpreter in regard to his statement respecting Judas which Dr Pusey has turned to his own account, to the injury of the fair fame of Augustine, making him by anticipation an upholder of the worst error of Paschasius. Happily for us the English Doctor, the venerable Bede, who lived 200 years before Paschasius divulged his heresy, in his commentary on 1 Corinthians xi. 26-29, compiled wholly from the writings of Augustine, has not only included the statement in question, but also other statements of a like kind, which, in fact, show not only how Augustine understood his own words, but how Bede himself in the seventh century must have understood them also. In 24 31, 32 references will be seen to those parts of Augustine's writings, from which Bede has made his citations. He quotes the statement given by Dr Pusey, as cited above (sec. 111) with which the reader will do well to refresh his memory. He will see how sorely Augustine has been misunderstood by Dr Pusey when he finds how Augustine has been made his own interpreter by his true disciple Bede. The statements cited by Bede will now be noticed in the order in which they stand in our edition of Augustine's writings.

119. 'For he who differs from Christ [as Judas did] neither eateth His flesh nor drinketh His blood, although he may daily indiscriminately receive the sacrament of so great a thing to the condemnation of his own presumption.' (21 21.)

The passage (21 76) has just been noticed. In 21 96 Augustine shows that as preaching, though in itself 'a sweet savour,' was to some for life and to others for death, so also was the sweet or good bread of the Lord's Supper. Thus he says, 'Of one bread both Peter and Judas received. . . . 'Peter received unto life, Judas unto death. Thus as it was 'with that sweet savour, so with that sweet food. As then 'the sweet savour, so also the sweet food is life to the good, 'death to the bad. "For whoso shall eat unworthily, eateth "and drinketh judgment to himself." The next statement will be found (21 104) which we shall consider presently. The last statement will be found (21 139) where Augustine asks, 'What is it to eat Christ?' and answers, 'It is not only 'to receive His body in the sacrament [or sacramentally, which 'Judas did only.] For many unworthy receive, of whom, saith 'the apostle, "Whoso eateth the bread and drinketh the cup "of the Lord unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to "himself."

120. The impartial testimony of Bede shown in the manner in which he very fairly makes Augustine his own interpreter needs no remark—it speaks for itself. One citation made by Bede we have yet to notice, as Dr Pusey endeavours therefrom to make it appear that Augustine conceived of two modes in which the Body, Soul, and Divinity of Christ could be received in the consecrated elements, and that in one of these modes the wicked could thus receive Christ.

121. Augustine had occasion to show that not every kind of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost was an unpardonable sin, but only blasphemy of a specific kind. To illustrate and confirm this opinion he adduced instances in the manner in which sometimes belief is exercised, and the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are received. (21 104.) Here he states that it is not any kind of belief nor any kind of baptism, but only some particular kind, respecting which it may be said, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Nor was it any manner of eating Christ's flesh and blood, but only some certain manner by which the communicant could dwell in Christ and Christ dwell in him. Augustine adduced the belief of devils, the baptism of Simon Magus, and Judas

and hypocrites as eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ. Respecting this Dr Pusey says, 'The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,' which yet does not come up to the fulness of the unpardonable sin, was still real blasphemy. The belief, wherewith the devils believed and trembled, was a real belief, although without love. The baptism, where-with Simon Magus was baptized, was real, valid baptism. So too, S. Augustine's argument required that the wicked really ate the body and drank the blood of Christ, although, receiving it without saving faith, or love, or obedience, they ate and drank it to their condemnation.'—(*Real Presence, &c.*, p. 268.)

122. This last statement, respecting what Augustine's argument required, is a clever way of making him a seeming witness in favour of Dr Pusey's doctrine. But the attempt is futile. Dr Pusey conveniently assumes that the cases adduced by Augustine were intended to be quite parallel to the one he intended to illustrate; but it can be easily proved that these were not intended to be really parallel cases. Dr Pusey rightly states, according to the conception of Augustine, 'The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which yet does not come up to the fulness of the unpardonable sin, was still real blasphemy,' but surely he wrongly infers that Augustine's argument required that as blasphemy was real, so the belief of devils, the baptism of Simon Magus and the eating of Christ's body and the drinking of His blood by Judas and hypocrites must be real also. The incorrectness of this inference will be seen by conducting the argument another step. As the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, though real, did not come up to the fulness of the unpardonable sin, so the belief of demons, though real belief, did not come up to the fulness of salvation, nor did the baptism of Simon Magus, although real baptism, come up far enough for him to be saved, nor the eating of Christ's body and the drinking of His blood by Judas and hypocrites come up to the fulness of having Christ to dwell in them and they in him. In the case regarding blasphemy there was real desert, though not such as to incur the penalty threatened; in the other cases there was no desert whatever approximating towards the blessings to be achieved.

These three last cases were never intended by Augustine to be really parallel to the first, and it seems very much like an insult to the understanding of Augustine to regard them as if they were.

123. But let us examine what these things were which Dr Pusey concludes Augustine considered as real. There are three, but it is the last one with which we are more especially concerned, viz., that Judas and those in hypocrisy did really eat the body and drink the blood of Christ. An examination of the first two will determine the nature of the third. The first is the real belief of devils. This belief in the mind of Augustine in comparison of that belief which saves the soul had only the name, and it must be from his point of view that we must consider it. The blasphemy had regard to the Holy Ghost, so if we follow out the analogy as assumed by Dr Pusey, the belief has regard to salvation, but according to Augustine the belief of devils had no such connection. With Augustine and with the Latin Fathers generally, an essential difference was made between the word 'believe' and the words 'believe *in*.' Thus Augustine says, 'Now the difference is 'great as to whether one believes that Jesus Christ is, or 'whether he believes *in* Christ. For that Jesus is Christ 'even the devils believed, and yet the devils believed not *in* 'Christ.'—(*De Verbis Domini*, ser. lxi. tom. x. p. 84.) In another discourse he states, 'But to believe that God really is, 'even the devils can do. But to believe *in* God, they only 'have acquired who love Him, who are Christians not only in 'name, but in acts and in life, for faith without love is vain. 'The faith of a Christian is with love—the faith of a devil is 'without love.'—(*Appendix de Diversis*, ser. lix., tom. x. p. 687.) It may be certainly concluded that the belief of devils was not a real belief; assuredly it was not so in the opinion of Augustine, with whom we are more especially concerned.

124. We shall now examine the second thing which Dr Pusey considers Augustine to have regarded as real, viz., that 'the baptism wherewith Simon Magus was baptized was real, 'valid baptism.' Have we any ground whatever to suppose that Simon Magus received anything more than the outward application of water—the mere sign in the absence of that

which was signified? How then can the baptism which he received be called real? Dr Pusey and all the disciples of Paschasius, in regard to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, maintain that the consecrated visible signs contain the things of which they are the signs, and therefore whoever receives the signs receives also the things signified. Is their belief the same in regard to Baptism? It ought to be, in order to be consistent; and if so, in accordance with such a view, the baptism of Simon Magus might be regarded as real. It is not to be questioned but that his baptism, as far as the outward rite was concerned, was real and valid. But that is quite beside the question. Doubtless the Word of God, whether written or spoken, is in itself intrinsically the same to saints and sinners. Thus of the words of Christ Augustine has well remarked, 'They are spiritually to be understood. Hast thou spiritually understood? They are spirit and life. Hast thou carnally understood? Even then they are spirit and life, but not to thee.' (21 89.) The divine rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are intrinsically the same to whomsoever they are offered. But a right or real reception of the Word of God and the sacraments is made to depend upon the state or condition of the recipients. Men may receive the sensible signs of God's Word, but not receive the Word itself, as also the sensible signs of the two Christian ordinances, but not receive the things of the signs, not but that the signs, both verbal and sacramental, are full of varied and precious signification. The fault is in the state or condition of the recipients. It is not to be supposed that Simon Magus was in a state to receive Baptism, or that therefore his baptism was real. Although real and valid Baptism was administered, yet his unhallowed condition was fatal to its reception, beyond the mere outward and sensible signs. Wherein he was unqualified to receive real Baptism as considered from an early patristic point of view may be seen in a previous chapter of this volume (Ch. iii. 103-109). Bede, who generally expresses the sentiments of Augustine, in his commentary on the words, 'Then Simon himself believed also; and being baptized,' (Acts viii. 13) says, 'It is more credible that Simon pretended that he believed so far as to receive Baptism.' Augustine cited the

words of St Peter in regard to Simon as they stood in the version of his day as follows :—‘Thou hast no part nor lot in ‘this faith’ (*hac fide*) (Acts viii. 21).

125. We now examine the third thing which Dr Pusey considers Augustine to have regarded as real, viz., ‘that the ‘wicked really eat the body and drink the blood of Christ.’ But this thing is made to depend upon the other two, for Dr Pusey says, ‘The belief wherewith the devils believed and ‘trembled was a real belief. The baptism wherewith Simon ‘Magus was baptized was real, valid baptism. So too, ‘S. Augustine’s argument required, that the wicked really ‘ate the body and drank the blood of Christ.’ But what if the belief exercised by devils was not real but vain, as in the mind of Augustine it most certainly was; and what if the baptism, not that wherewith Simon was baptized, but that which he received, for this is the correct mode of putting the case, was unreal, he actually receiving only the outward form thereof, which doubtless was the opinion of Augustine, then his argument requires that the wicked do not really eat the body and blood of Christ, that as Simon Magus did not really receive Baptism, but the outward part only, so Judas in the Lord’s Supper received the outward signs, but did not really receive the things signified thereby.

126. But Dr Pusey yet makes another effort to make Augustine’s teaching admit of the Paschasian notion of there being such a real and actual presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, that whoever receives them receives also with them Christ’s Body, Soul, and Divinity. The synonymous words employed by Augustine to express the participation or the reception of Christ’s body and blood, such as receiving, taking, eating, and participating, he makes into two distinct modes of reception, in one of which he maintains that the wicked can really receive whole Christ, human and Divine. He states—‘The other passage in which S. Augustine says, ‘that to “eat Christ” is “not *only* to receive His body in the ‘sacrament,” shows how well Archbishop Parker understood ‘S. Augustine when he adopted the words “partakers of ‘“Christ” as expressing S. Augustine’s mind. He says, that ‘they who dwell not in Christ, nor Christ in them, receive the

‘sacrament, and, receiving it, “receive His body in the sacrament,” but receive it to their condemnation. They receive the body of Christ, but do not “eat Christ,” because, he says, Christ does not and will not dwell in their souls. To “eat Christ,” then, is, in his mind, to be “partaker of Christ.”’
—(*The Real Presence, &c.*, pp. 268, 269.)

127. A little above we noticed how Dr Pusey blended the definition of a sacrament as given in the Church Catechism with the definition given by Augustine, and appeared to make them one and the same, assuming not only that the definition of the Catechism, but even his misrepresentation of it was Augustine’s. Here we have a striking resemblance of the same thing. Thus what Parker understood respecting Augustine’s account of sacramental participation is considered to be Augustine’s mind upon that point, and upon this he founds a very curious argument, which he concludes thus, ‘To “eat Christ,” then, is, in his mind [Augustine’s] to be “partaker of Christ.”’ But what proof have we that that was Augustine’s mind? The proof which Dr Pusey gives is, ‘Parker well understood S. Augustine when he adopted the words, “partakers of Christ,” as expressing S. Augustine’s mind.’ So Parker’s mind being Augustine’s, Parker’s phrase, ‘partakers of Christ’ is regarded as if it were Augustine’s. A curious mode of reasoning certainly.

128. It is not denied, however, but maintained, that Parker in the 29th Article most truly expressed Augustine’s mind. If he does express Augustine’s mind, Dr Pusey has most certainly misrepresented both; for so far from teaching that the wicked receive the Body, Soul, and Divinity of Christ in the sacrament, they both plainly maintain that they only receive the sacrament or sign of the reality, but not the reality itself, and as to the distinction between receiving and eating or participating, it is but a fiction ascribed to Augustine which will be shown to have no existence in fact. The 29th Article which Dr Pusey ascribes to Parker is as follows:—

‘Of the wicked which do not eat the body of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper.

‘The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St

‘Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.’

129. Here, beyond all question, we are taught what the wicked do and do not eat in the Lord's Supper, viz., that they do not eat the body of Christ, but eat by carnally and visibly pressing with their teeth the sign or sacrament of so great a thing, that is the body of Christ. But Dr Pusey maintains that the wicked in the Supper do not only carnally and visibly press with their teeth the sign or sacrament of so great a thing, but in the sacrament or sign receive, but do not eat, the thing or reality itself, which, as explained by him, is the Body, Soul, and Divinity of Christ; and these sentiments he would feign persuade his readers to receive as those of Parker, for he says, ‘The other passage in which S. Augustine says, that to “eat Christ” is “not only to receive His body in the “sacrament,” shows how well Archbishop Parker understood S. Augustine, when he adopted the words “partakers of Christ” as expressing S. Augustine's mind.’

130. To show that we do not misinterpret the article, we shall give the testimony of two opposite parties. The earliest exposition of the Articles is by Rogers, published about fifteen years after the framing of the Article in question. In this exposition, after giving what he considered as ‘the proof from God's Word,’ he remarks—‘Of this judgment be other churches, Christian and reformed besides,’ and gives proofs from all the Protestant Confessions, and, of course, the Zwinglian among the rest. The extracts which here follow are specimens from the Zwinglian Confession.

‘Therefore the faithful do receive that which is given by the minister of the Lord, and do eat the bread of the Lord, and drink of the Lord's cup. But yet, by the working of Christ, through the Holy Ghost, they receive also the flesh and blood of the Lord, and do feed on them to life everlasting. For the flesh and blood of Christ is true meat and drink unto everlasting life: yea, Christ himself, in that He was delivered for us, and is our Saviour, is that special thing and substance of the Supper; and, therefore, we suffer nothing to be put in His place. . . . Besides that former spiritual eating, there is a sacramental eating of the body of the Lord, whereby the faithful man not only is a partaker, spiritually and internally, of

‘the true body and blood of the Lord, &c.’ . . . But as for him that ‘without faith cometh to this Holy Table of the Lord, he is made partaker of the sacrament only ; but the matter [reality] of the sacrament, from whence cometh life and salvation, he receiveth not at all : and such men do unworthily eat of the Lord’s Table. . . . As by bread the bodies are nourished and strengthened, so the godly do believe, that by the body of the Lord, delivered unto death for them, they are fed to everlasting life. In this sort is the Supper of the Lord accomplished spiritually, thus are the bread and wine a sacrament unto us, and not bare and naked signs. In this holy Supper of the faithful the Lord is present, and doth work effectually by the Spirit in their hearts, as He who, according to His promise, is in the midst of them. “Whosoever shall eat of this bread, and drink of this “cup unworthily” (that is, without faith, by which alone we are made partakers of the Lord and of salvation), “he doth eat and “drink judgment unto himself.”’—(*The Harmony of the Protestant Confessions of Faith*, pp. 316-319, 323, 324.)

131. Rogers, after having referred to the Protestant Confessions in support of what he considered to be the truth of the Article, points out the ‘*errors and adversaries unto this truth.*’

‘The adversaries of this doctrine are the Ubiquitaries, both ‘Lutheran and Popish ; they saying, the very body of Christ, ‘at the Lord’s Supper, is eaten as well of the wicked as of the ‘godly ; these affirming that all communicants, bad and good, ‘do eat the very and natural body of Christ Jesus ; they saying that the true and real body of Christ, in, with, under the ‘bread and wine, may be eaten, chewed, and digested, even of ‘Turks, which never were of the Church ; and these maintaining that, under the form of bread, the same true and real ‘body of Christ may be devoured of dogs, hogs, cats, and rats.’ In the margin Rogers refers to the authors of these sentiments. Such, then, is the testimony of a friend of the 29th Article. It remains now that we give the testimony of an enemy of it.

132. Geste, a bishop of the English Church, in a letter to Lord Burleigh in the year 1571, thus writes:—

‘My Lord grace of Canterbury [Parker], is purposed to present to ‘the Queen’s Majesty the first copy of the book of Articles (to the which ‘the most part of bishops have subscribed), to have it authorised by ‘her Majesty, and there is this Article, “Evil men receive not the “body of Christ,” which article is not in the printed books, either Latin or English. If this article be confirmed and authorised by the

'Queen's grace, it will cause much business, because it is quite contrary to the Scripture, and to the doctrine of the Fathers, for it is certain that Judas, as evil as he was, did receive Christ's body, because Christ said unto him, "Take, eat, this is my body." It is not said, if thou be a good or a faithful man, "take, eat, this is my body," but simply without any such condition, "take, eat, this is my body." So that to all men which be of the Church, and of the profession of Christ, whether they be good or bad, faithful or unfaithful (for to them only Christ spoke these words, "take, eat, this is my body," and not to the Jew, Turk, miscreant, beast, or bird) Christ's body is given, and they do receive it. That is the cause that Paul saith "whosoever shall eat of this bread and drink of the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, for he that eateth or drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh his own damnation, because he maketh no difference of the Lord's body." Note well these words—the "Lord's body." It is not here said the sign or sacrament of the Lord's body, nor the grace or fruit of the Lord's body, nor the memory of the Lord's passion, but plainly the Lord's body, to teach us that the evil men of the Church do receive Christ's body.'—(*Supplement to Dean Goode's Work on the Eucharist*, pp. 10, 11.)

133. It would seem Lord Burleigh, to whom Bishop Geste addressed his letter, conferred with Archbishop Parker on the subject, for Parker thus writes to him—'Sir, I have considered what your honour said to me this day concerning St Augustine's authority in the article [the 29th] in the first original agreed upon; and I am advisedly still in mine opinion concerning so much, wherefore they be alleged in the Article; and for further truth of the words, besides St. Austin, both he in other places, and Prosper in his "Sentences, wrote of "Austin" (*Senten.* 338 and 339), doth plainly affirm our opinion in the Article to be most true, howsoever some men vary from it.'—(*Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, p. 381.) The sentences alluded to will be found (21 20, 21.) This completes our evidence that Archbishop Parker, in the 29th Article, did not teach that 'the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith,' do and can receive in the Lord's Supper the Reality of which the consecrated elements are the sign or sacrament.

134. It remains now that we very briefly dispel the illusion which Dr Pusey has raised respecting the two modes of receiving the reality of the sacrament, which he unwarrant-

ably ascribes to Augustine, He says—‘What S. Augustine denies of the wicked, he always expresses in the very words of S. John’s gospel, “neither eat (*manducat*) His flesh nor “drink His blood.” He does not deny, he even affirms, that “those who eat and drink unworthily *receive* the body of “Christ in the sacrament.” But he affirms that they do not *eat Christ*, unless they dwell in Christ and Christ in them. “What is to *eat Christ*? It is *not only to receive* “His body in the sacrament. For many unworthy receive, “&c.”’ (*Ibid.*, pp. 273, 274.) Dr Pusey must be troubled with a very short memory, as well as with an imperfect knowledge of Augustine’s writings in relation to sacramental participation; for only a few pages before, under the heading, ‘Yet S. Augustine’s statements, that the wicked do receive the body of Christ, are very distinct. I will take only such as are quite explicit.’ Among thirteen statements, the second which Dr Pusey selects is the following:—‘The rich upon earth in this place (Ps. xxii. 29) are to be understood as the proud. For it is not in vain that they have been so distinguished that it should be said above concerning the poor—“The poor shall eat and be satisfied;” but in this place—“All such as be rich upon earth have eaten and worshipped.” For they, too, have been brought to the Table of Christ, and receive of His body and blood; but they worship only: they are not satisfied, because they do not imitate. For *eating* “[*manducantes*] Him, who is poor, they disdain to be poor; since “Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example that we “should follow His steps.”’ (p. 262.) In brief, Dr Pusey expresses the same thing thus—‘The proud rich receive of His body ‘and blood,’ *eat* Him who is poor. (p. 265.)

135. The fact is, Augustine represents the unworthy communicant as taking, receiving, eating, or participating of Christ in the sacrament, or sacramentally, equally with the worthy communicant; but that is all; whereas the worthy take, receive, eat, or participate of the reality of the sacrament, but the wicked do no such thing. The very passage from Augustine on which Dr Pusey pretends to found the two modes of receiving Christ confirms the above view of the case. ‘Augustine affirms that they do not eat Christ, unless they

‘dwell in Christ and Christ in them. “What is to *eat Christ*? “It is not only to receive His body in the sacrament. For “many unworthy receive, &c.”’ Here, if language means anything, Augustine teaches that unworthy communicants eat Christ in the sacrament, or sacramentally, or the sacrament of His body, as well as the worthy communicants do, but that is all; for we are told in the 29th Article of Religion, which Dr Pusey maintains expresses the mind of Augustine, and which we do not deny, that ‘The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they partakers [receivers or eaters] of Christ, but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.’

136. But Dr Pusey has told us ‘how well Parker understood S. Augustine when he adopted the words, “partakers “of Christ,” as expressing S. Augustine’s mind.’ (p. 268.) But if we examine how Augustine himself expresses his own mind in his writings, we shall find that, as he speaks of unworthy communicants as eating Christ or His body, so also he speaks of their being made partakers of the body of Christ. In his great work, ‘On the City of God,’ he had occasion to speak of certain classes of error in religion. Two of these we shall do well to notice. From the circumstance of our Lord having said, ‘If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever,’ one class inferred that whoever received the sacrament of Baptism and of the Eucharist, in whatever manner they lived, in whatever heresy or wickedness they might be, they would be delivered at some time or other from eternal punishment. Another class held out the same hope to such as had fallen into heresy and heathen idolatry, provided they had once received the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist in the true Church, and had not only eaten the body of Christ in the sacrament (which thing the other class was only supposed to do), but also in reality which the other class was not supposed to do. Augustine’s own account is given (21 32-34), where it will be seen, in regard to the former class, he speaks of their sacramental participation thus—‘Who are made partakers of

‘His body.’ (21 32.) ‘Have been made partakers of His ‘body.’ (21 33.) Augustine did not consider those wretched characters to be partakers of Christ really, but only sacramentally, or in the sacrament or sign. For in regard both to the former and latter class, he says—‘They are not to be said ‘to eat the body of Christ, because neither are they to be ‘accounted among the members of Christ, &c.’ (21 34.) It would be interesting to know why Dr Pusey has not given his readers the benefit of these two instances relating to sacramental participation, seeing he has given so many extracts from Augustine far less calculated to give his full and fair testimony on the various points in dispute.

137. Since Paschasius introduced the doctrine of the real presence of Christ’s body and blood in the consecrated elements nearly a thousand years ago, the most subtle wits of the Roman Church have been constant in their endeavours to reconcile Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers with the teaching of the Paschasian heresy. The task, however, we are certain is an impossible one. With this party it is assumed that the Scripture must be interpreted by the Fathers to whom they profess to appeal as the only authorised means of knowing the will of Christ and the binding rules of His Church. But what a continent of religious thoughts and sentiments, what flights of rhetoric, and mazes of allegory, have to be explored in the hundreds of folio volumes of Greek and Latin in order to know the fulness of the Divine will as supposed to be therein recorded for the guidance of the Church! To put the Fathers in this position is neither more nor less than an insult to their memory, and a contravening of their most cherished opinions as recorded in their writings which have come down to us; for no men could well make a broader distinction between Divine tradition and human—between what saith the Scripture and what saith man, or a council of men. But whence has it come to pass that these modern patrons of the Fathers do what the Fathers did not do, and omit to do what they did? New doctrines and practices, when binding on the conscience, require some foundation on which to base them, and which, if not found in the canonical Scriptures, must be sought for elsewhere. It is needless to say that Ritualists, as well as

Roman Catholics, have both doctrines and practices which they do not pretend to find in the New Testament, and which are therefore too modern to rest upon so ancient a foundation. It should be borne in mind that Ritualists and High Anglicans profess a profound regard for antiquity, but then it must not be too old, not too closely defined, and not restricted to any particular century of the Christian era, least of all to the first and second centuries. Unity, antiquity, and universality, are words of immense convenience to Romanists and Romanizers. Admitting the appeal which the acceptance of such terms involves, we are at once taken from the simple and infallible records of the New Testament, contained in a small volume, to two or three hundred folio volumes of Christian records locked up in the Greek and Latin languages, the key of which only few possess, and still fewer use who do possess it, either from want of taste, interest, or time. The immensity of this comparatively inaccessible region of sentiment and thought, when admitted to be the ground of appeal for any doctrine which is binding on the conscience, affords opportunities for the supporters of any particular heresy to assume proofs for it which cannot well be gainsayed, and for the best of all reasons because the source of appeal is almost as inaccessible to most as are the regions of the moon. To give a real illustration of what we mean, it may be stated as a fact that, during the last three or four hundred years, the disciples of Paschasius have defended the heresy of their master by an appeal to the testimony of the Fathers. Of more modern times Dr Pusey's efforts are a case in point. Out of such an infinite variety of utterances, many ornate with the most florid rhetoric, and others abstruse with mystic allusion or involved in profound allegory, it would not be difficult to select phrases, garble passages, take figurative forms of speech for literal forms, things which take the names of the things which they signify as if they really were the things signified, and add an additional sense to certain words where required, such as sacrament, sacramentally, mystery, mystically, spiritual, and spiritually, and thus form a semblance of the Paschasian heresy. This, set forth with a conspicuous display of imposing names, with a bold assumption that it has been believed always, every-

where, and by all, such a system will find acceptance with many, as in fact we know it has. This is not an imaginary picture, but a real one, in proof whereof we refer to that of which it is a picture, viz., Dr Pusey's elaborate defence of the Paschasian heresy. Only let a man of sober and good understanding by patient, prolonged, and persevering labour, place himself in such a position that he can, from his own personal knowledge, ascertain what the Fathers and Christian authors of the first eight centuries teach in regard to the Lord's Supper, and what Paschasius, as well as his most successful disciples also teach, and we are confident the two systems of teaching on the subject in question will be found absolutely contradictory and utterly irreconcilable. The attempt on the part of Dr Pusey to reconcile his teaching with that of Archbishop Parker, or rather with the 29th Article and with Augustine, only shows a very small fraction of the difficulty. We are now prepared to exhibit the difficulty on a much larger scale.

138. About 700 years ago, when the doctrine of Paschasius on the Real Presence had been formally received by the Roman Church, Gratian, a Roman canonist, selected an immense body of canons, or rules concerning faith and practice, from the leading Church authors of the first eleven centuries. Although a disciple of Paschasius, in his collection of canons respecting the Lord's Supper, he has given some of the most telling passages from Augustine, which in fact refuted the doctrine of Paschasius. If it should be asked why he was so unfortunate in selecting such passages, which, indeed, have given infinite trouble to modern Paschasians, the answer is, that these passages were so commonly cited by the Venerable Bede in his well-known writings, and by his disciples, as well as by Berenger and others, against Paschasius, that had he been so disposed he could not well have omitted them, as Dr Pusey, for the most part, has done in his 400 pages of citations from the Fathers, notwithstanding his strong avowal of impartiality in citation (35 41) and his desire to be regarded as having been conscientious in the performance. (35 53.) Out of the ten most important extracts cited by Gratian as canons, only two of these are cited in Dr Pusey's *catena*

patrum; they are numbered 46 and 92.—(See secs. 147, 158, below.)

139. In this collection of rules in regard to the Lord's Supper, we have citations from Paschasius himself, as well as from one of his foremost disciples and chief defenders, Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury. In the 48th of these rules there is a phrase, 'We drink His blood under the form and 'flavour of wine,' from Lanfranc, which Dr Pusey has cited under the name of Augustine. (See 35 33, and chap. viii. 73.) Interspersed with the outrageous sentiments of Paschasius, Lanfranc, and the monstrous confession thrust into the mouth of Berenger, we have some of the most important citations from Augustine, which, in fact, are plain contradictions of the doctrine of Paschasius and his disciples. Modern Paschasians could not set aside these selections from Augustine or the headings by which they were introduced by Gratian. The only alternative was to interpret them according to the exact shade of Paschasian doctrine authorised by the Roman Catholic authorities. * These interpretations, or glosses as they are called, are more extensive than that which they gloss. It is probable that the character of these glosses, and their employment in this case, have given rise in more modern times to such words of reproach as gloze, glozing, and glozer. That the reader may see and judge for himself how the plain teaching of Augustine has been misinterpreted by Roman Catholics, we shall here give some of the passages cited from Augustine, as headed by the remarks of Gratian, and as glossed by comparatively modern glossers, and it is thought the candid reader will see how abortive the attempt is which has been made to bring into agreement the teaching of Augustine in relation to the doctrine of the real presence with that of Paschasius and his disciples on the same subject. The title of the great work from which we make the citations is, *Corpus Juris Canonici*, and the part especially cited is, *Decreti Pars Tertia de Consecratione Distinctio*, ii.

140. The first canon which we shall notice is headed by Gratian thus—'What a sacrifice is, and what a sacrament.' The canon is xxxii—"A visible sacrifice is an invisible sacrament—that is, a sacred sign." Elsewhere it is—"A sacra-

“ment is a visible form of invisible grace.” Respecting the first of these definitions it is properly stated that ‘In the original and by Lanfranc it is—“Therefore a visible sacrifice is “a sacrament of an invisible sacrifice, that is, a sacred sign.”’ [21 28.] The second definition is not in the words of Augustine; but two similar instances are cited “Concerning the “sacrament which he hath well received, since it hath been “well commended to him, that things visible are indeed “signs of divine realities, but that in the signs the invisible “realities themselves are honoured.”’ [21 26.] The other instance is taken from the 166th Epistle of Augustine. “But “if the man is evil, God by him performs a visible form of “sacrament, but He Himself gives the invisible grace.” Then follows the gloss on the word ‘*sacrifice*.’ ‘It is said ‘that in the body of the Lord there are three things, namely, ‘form, reality, and figure.’ It is further added—‘Therefore ‘it is here said that a visible sacrifice, that is, a visible form, ‘is bread, that is, signifies an invisible sacrament, that is, the ‘body of Christ, which to us is invisible, for glorified bodies ‘are not seen by men unless by a miracle.’ The gloss founded on the incorrect citation from Augustine, “invisible sacrament,” which should have been “a sacrament of an invisible sacrifice,” is, ‘That is, an invisible sign, the body of Christ, which ‘is the sacrament of the Church.’ On the word ‘*sign*’ the gloss is, ‘That is, a sign of an invisible thing, or a sign of a ‘sacred invisible thing.’ Concerning the definition of a ‘*sacrament*,’ the gloss is, ‘It is not a general definition. For the ‘body of Christ, the sacrament of the Church, is invisible to us, ‘and thus is not a visible form; yet it can be said that it is ‘general, for a body is visible to those at least who are with it, ‘although not to us.’

141. As the next canon is like this, we shall first give it, and then notice both. The heading is, ‘What is a ‘sign?’ The canon is—xxxiii., “A sign is a thing which, besides the “form which it presents to the senses, causes something else “external to itself to come into the mind.”’ [21 9.] The gloss is, ‘A *sign*, that is, the form of bread and wine, is another ‘thing besides that which is seen, and shows and denotes some ‘other thing, as a circle denotes wine for sale (*sicut circulus*

'vinum vœnale'). External to itself. That is, from its own form and composition, for bread is made of pure grain: so 'the body of Christ is understood of its members.' The statements of Augustine are plain enough; but what a hash is here made of them! Indeed there is no other way of cooking the statements of Augustine to make them conformable to the Paschasian taste, nor has Dr Pusey, with all the advantages of his school, as yet found any other. Augustine himself says, 'When signs appertain to divine things they are called sacraments.' (21 1.) Doubtless Gratian and his glossers are called upon to define a sacrament and a sign much after the same manner. For in the definition of a sacrifice we have, in fact, their definition of a sacrament, where we are given to understand that there is besides what the eye sees an invisible sign, which is the body of Christ, which is also a sacrament, that is, a sign or a figure of the Church. The definition of a sign is nearly the same as that of a sacrament. It has a form (which, as understood by Roman Catholics, is a mere appearance or show) of bread and wine, and itself is another thing (viz., the body of Christ), which other thing signifies, or is a sacrament of Christ's mystical body or His true Church. How Augustine himself explains the words sacrament and sign we have noticed in the tenth chapter (sec. 13). If the reader will still further turn to the extracts from Augustine's treatise, whence this part of his definition of a sign has been taken, he will there see that he is not merely defining a sacramental sign spoken of in connection with the Lord's Supper, but signs in general, such as appear to the senses of hearing and seeing, of which there is a vast number. So that when Augustine says 'a sign is a thing which, besides the form which it presents to the senses, causeth something else external to itself to come into the mind,' is just as applicable to a verbal sign as it is to a sacramental one. In the very same treatise he actually calls sacraments visible words in contrast to words spoken. Let the reader examine the citation made by Gratian from Augustine in the light of a portion of its context, as given 21 8-17, and he will be amazed to see how men of learning and Christian character could so absurdly misrepresent Augustine's definition of a sign. So far from making Augustine's

sense in regard to the definition of a sacrament and sign more transparent by their glosses, they have thereby destroyed it. But why should such liberties be taken with the plain statements of Augustine? The fact is, if he is to be the patron of the Paschasian heresy he must be made to teach that, in a sacrament or sign in relation to the Lord's Supper, there must be the real body of Christ, and hence Dr Pusey so interprets the various sacramental words used by the Fathers generally, such as sign, figure, image, sacrament, &c., that the visible things to which these synonymous terms are applied shall be considered to be or to contain the real body and blood of Christ. (See ch. x. 30-47.)

142. The next extract cited by Gratian from Augustine as a canon is numbered xxxvi., and will be found in the writings of Bede (24 28), whence it has been cited. By Gratian it has been headed thus, 'Why Christ has ministered to us 'His own sacrament in the form of bread and wine.' The part of the gloss with which we are more especially concerned is, '*Which He hath even made us ourselves.*' 'This is a 'simple figure of speech, for it refers to the Church, not to 'His own body, which He took of the Virgin, of which the 'Word went before. He did not therefore make us His own 'body, which was born of the Virgin, and is taken on the 'altar under the form of bread and wine, but He made us His 'own Body spiritually, that is to say, the church of the 'faithful. So therefore he calls it a spiritual body, although 'it may consist of corporal parts, that is to say, of the faithful.' '*And ye were made the Lord's Bread.*' That is respecting 'the body of the church which by the Lord's body is figured.'

143. A portion of the same extract from Augustine is made into another separate canon, and is headed thus, 'Christ's body 'is understood in a twofold manner. "lxii. Christ com- 'mended to us His body and blood in this sacrament, which 'also He made even us ourselves. For we also have been 'made the body of Himself.'" [24 28.] The gloss is, '*He commended.*' 'That is to say, His own body, which is the 'Church, a simple figure of speech as it were.' '*The body of Himself.*' 'Spiritual body, whilst we are in the Church 'deservedly and in name.'

144. Here we are taught contrary to Dr Pusey, but in accordance with the Reformers, that Christ's spiritual body, or His body spiritually, is not inclusive of, but in contradistinction to, the body which was born of Mary. As a matter of simple certainty, Augustine taught no other presence of a body in the sacrament than a spiritual body, and one that could be received spiritually only. Will Dr Pusey, Archdeacon Freeman, and Sir Robert Phillimore accept the testimony of Bertram on this point whom they profess to esteem as being such an important witness? Well, he says, 'S. Augustine sufficiently teacheth us that, in the bread which is placed on the altar, the body of Christ is signified, as well as the body of the people who receive, to the intent he might plainly show Christ's proper body to be that in which He was born of the virgin, &c. But that which is placed on the Lord's Table containeth the mystery of that body, as also again it containeth the mystery of the body of believing people, as the Apostle testifieth, "We being many are one bread and one body in Christ."' (25 61.)

145. Let the reader ponder well, and especially if he is a disciple of Paschasius, the citation made by Gratian, as recorded 24 28, and he will be as sure as Bertram was, that Augustine speaks more plainly, and even more emphatically, on the fact of Christ's body of believing people being *present* in the sacrament on the table, and in the cup, than he does of Christ's body and blood, not however of Christ's body which was crucified, and of the blood which was shed by the soldier's spear, but of His body and blood spiritually. According to the plain teaching of Augustine, and as confirmed by Bertram, what represents the one body in the sacrament represents the other also; in fact, that in the sacrament, according to the very full teaching of Augustine, which we have noticed elsewhere (Ch. xi. 85-97), the two are as one.

146. Here in the gloss we have a striking instance how the disciples of Paschasius can take the sacramental language of the Fathers spiritually and figuratively, when it suits their doctrine to do so. But the sacramental language of the Fathers requires something which is signified, and which is neither actually nor really present. Observe how the gloss

meets this requirement. On the words, 'ye are made the 'Lord's bread.' It is remarked, 'That is respecting the 'body of the Church which by the Lord's body [meaning the 'real body born of Mary, believed to be present in the bread] 'is figured.' We have also seen, as explained above, that a sign as well as a sacrament is made to consist of three parts, what is seen, the reality, and what is signified or figured. What is seen are the elements, the reality is the body of Christ which was crucified, and this reality is said to figure or signify Christ's mystical body, or His Church, but not supposed to be actually or really present. Lanfranc and Bellarmine, both after this absurd manner, misrepresented the teaching of the Fathers, and it is the common doctrine of the Roman Church. Thus to harmonize the teaching of the Fathers with the wretched doctrine of Paschasius, their signs are converted into realities, and their realities into signs.

147. These Paschasians, in their abortive attempt to harmonize Augustine with their errors, where he most distinctly speaks of Christ having made devout communicants to be even His own body and blood, and says in the most unqualified manner that at the table 'they are what they 'receive,' and that 'there they are on the table, and there 'they are in the cup,' all this they correctly enough understand to be figurative, mystical, or spiritual, and explain it accordingly. Augustine himself gives no such explanation, but in another place, where he is speaking of the body of Christ, and might be understood by his unlearned hearers to be speaking of Christ's real body, which was born of Mary, he uses a qualifying phrase which forbids any such conclusion, but this they take literally, utterly disregarding the qualification of Augustine, even though the very Latin word he uses is employed by Paschasians themselves to distinguish what is real from what is not so. The ninety-second canon of Gratian is a remarkable illustration of this very thing. The heading of the canon is, 'We daily eat Christ's real body and drink 'His real blood.' The part of the canon which we shall quote is, "'David was carried in his own hands. In His own "'hands is no man carried. How this may be understood of "'David according to the letter, we find not; but in Christ

“we find. For Christ was carried in His own hands, when
 “commending His own body He said, *This is my body.*
 “For that body He carried in His own hands.” (21
 49.) Now, in all honesty this portion of the canon being
 headed as it is by Gratian, ought to have been glossed
 to this effect, *Christ was carried in His ‘own hands.’*
 ‘That is not actually and really, but only *in a certain*
manner, viz., figuratively or spiritually.’ We speak con-
 fidently on this point, for it is in fact the very way in
 which Augustine qualified his own language. Thus he
 says, ‘When He commended His own body and blood He
 ‘took into His own hands that which the faithful know, and
 ‘*in a certain manner* carried Himself when He said, “This is
 “my body.” (21 49.) So far then is this citation when honestly
 made from being a proof that Christ’s real body is eaten in the
 sacrament it is a proof that the real body which was born of
 Mary is not eaten, but only His body *in a certain manner*.
 Augustine uses the phrase in question, as also do even Pascha-
 sian theologians, in contradistinction to what is actual and real
 which we shall now show. In regard to Augustine he says,
 ‘As therefore after *a certain manner* the sacrament of the
 ‘body of Christ is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the
 ‘blood of Christ is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of
 ‘faith is faith.’ (21 3.) ‘For the devil himself is the head
 ‘of the wicked who are *in a certain manner* his body . . .
 ‘as Christ is the head of the Church, which is His body.’ (21
 17.) ‘The Word of God, which in words is opened to us
 ‘daily, and *in a certain manner* is broken, is daily bread.’
 (21 113.) ‘Christ is, *in a certain manner*, the entire Christ,
 ‘in the fulness of the Church, that is, Head and Body, accord-
 ‘ing to the fulness of a certain perfect man, in which man we
 ‘all are members.’ (21 114.) ‘Because all things which repre-
 ‘sent other things appear *in a certain manner* to sustain the
 ‘characters of those things which they signify, as it is said by
 ‘the Apostle “That Rock was Christ,” since the rock of which
 ‘this was spoken signified Christ.’ (21 31.)

148. These illustrations make Augustine his own inter-
 preter, but especially the last one. We have only to apply
 the general principle here laid down to the particular case,

and Augustine's meaning in the citation in question is determined to a certainty. Because consecrated bread in the Eucharist represents the body of Christ, it appears *in a certain manner* to sustain the character of the body which it signifies, as it is said, by our Lord, 'This is my body.'

149. Barradius, a Roman Catholic divine, said to have acquired the title of the Apostle of Portugal, uses the phrase in question in contradistinction to what is actual or real. Thus he says, 'There is in the same Eucharist a sign of the union of Christ with His people. For water which is poured into wine represents the people. But as it is united with wine, yea, converted into wine, so they who take the Eucharist worthily adhere to Christ, and *in a certain manner* (*quodammodo*) are converted into Him, according to Augustine's Confessions, book vii., chapter 10, "I am the food of grown men; grow, and thou shalt feed upon me, nor shalt thou convert me, like the food of thy flesh into thee, but thou shalt be converted into me."—(*Comment in Con. et Hist. Quat. Evang.*, lib. x., c. 9; *Opera*, tom. ii., p. 654.) The qualifying phrase in question as much forbids us to conclude that Christ carried His real body in His hands as that believers are really converted into Him.

150. The same author then goes on to comment on a passage from Augustine parallel to the one cited in the 36th and 62d canons of Gratian.—(Secs. 142, 143.) Thus he says,—

'Also in the sacrament of the Eucharist the union of Christians among themselves which charity effects. For as one bread is made from many grains, and one wine from many grapes, so through faith and charity Christians are made one. Augustine, in a sermon on the sacrament to young people at the altar, according to Bede, 1 Cor. x. [see. 24 26, and 21 136], said, "Ye are the body of Christ"—(that is to say, the mystical body)—"and members. If, therefore, ye are the body of Christ and members, the mystery of yourselves is placed upon the Lord's table," &c. "The mystery of yourselves." That is the sign of your unity. "Recollect that bread is not made of one grain but of many; many grapes hang upon a bunch, but the juice of them is mingled together into one; thus hath the Lord signified us, wished us to belong to Himself, consecrated upon His table the mystery of peace and our unity." Thus Augustine. Whence from the Council of Trent, sess. 12, cap. 8, the sacrament of the Eucharist is called "the sign of unity, the bond of charity, the symbol of concord." Therefore it behoves him who receives the

‘symbol of concord and the sign of peace to live with nearness in the highest concord and peace. “He who receives the mystery of unity” (says Augustine in the same place), and does not hold the bond of “peace, does not receive the mystery in favour of himself, but as a “testimony against himself,” &c. Again he says, “Ye see how you “are one, what has been done, so be ye one by loving, by holding “one faith, one hope, indivisible charity.” [24 28.] . . . Therefore “in the most sacred Eucharist there is the natural body of Christ and “the mystical body. The mystical is in the aforesaid sign [not really “in the Eucharist]. But the natural body with the soul and Divinity “is really and substantially’ [in the Eucharist].—(*Ibid.*, p. 654.)

151. To make the plain teaching of the Fathers compatible with that of Paschasius where they speak figuratively as the context shows, his disciples perversely interpret literally, yet as we have just seen, they can interpret the language of the Fathers spiritually, even in passages where the language appears most literal, and without any qualifying term to make it otherwise.

152. Of all the extracts adduced from the Fathers this one of Augustine’s respecting Christ carrying Himself in His own hands has been most prominently employed by Paschasians in proof of the real or natural body of Christ being in the consecrated elements, but in almost all cases it is cited without the phrase which really determines beyond a doubt Augustine’s meaning, viz., not that Christ actually or really carried His body in His hands, but only did so *in a certain manner*. Two or three instances in illustration will now be given from different, though perhaps not from independent sources. We begin first with the Roman Catholics. Out of all the ten or more folio volumes of Augustine’s writings, in a catechism composed by the decree of the Council of Trent we find only one citation from Augustine, and that is the one in question to show ‘the reality of Christ’s body in the sacrament,’ and it is introduced thus :—‘To these, exactly agrees what S. Augustine, the vigorous defender of the Catholic faith, always taught. And first, expounding the title of the 33d Psalm, ‘he writes, “To carry Himself in His own hands is to man “an impossible thing, and is proper to Christ alone; for “He was carried in His own hands when giving that body “of His, He said, *This is my body.*”’—(*Part II. of the Sacrament of the Eucharist*, ch. 27).

153. We must now give an instance or two from another source, viz., High Anglican, Ritualistic, or by whatever title a very distinct class of men in the Church of England is known. Dr Pusey, much after the manner of the modern Roman Catechism, gives peculiar prominence to the citation, as we learn from the connection in which it is placed in his sermon, and from the fact that in that connection it is the only citation from Augustine, and, doubtless, in his judgment it must be the best he could give from him in proof of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements. Here is the citation—'He was carried in His own hands, when 'commending His own body to us, He said, "This is my "body."' (*The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist*, p. 52.) Now, had Dr Pusey cited Augustine's sentiments from his second sermon on the same subject, thus—'When 'He commended His own body and blood He took into His 'own hands that which the faithful know, and *in a certain* 'manner carried Himself, when He said, "This is my body"' (21 49), he would have stated Augustine's true sentiments honestly and fairly; but then they would have been against, not for, himself. We have another accusation against Dr Pusey. In the very discourse from which he made his citation, Augustine lays down his own principles of interpreting mysteries or sacraments, and gives a very necessary caution not to keep too close to the letter. Augustine's own words may be seen (21 49, at the commencement), which the reader will do well to compare with another part of his well-known teaching. (21 11-13.) So important did Augustine consider the right interpretation of sacramental language, that, in a sermon on the following day on the same subject, he alluded to it again. (Sec. 21 49, the latter part.) If we are to understand the sentiments of Augustine, we must be guided by his own rules, not by our fancies, nor by any exigencies which may arise from having to defend a cherished heresy.

154. In all fairness to Augustine, it should be stated that he had been unfortunately misled by a poor Latin or Italic translation of the Greek Septuagint version of the Hebrew Scriptures. In commenting on the title of the 34th Psalm, he, as was natural, quoted what he supposed to be a part of

the incident on which it was founded, as recorded 1 Sam. xxi. 13, but unfortunately was misled by the odd phrase, 'was carried in his own hands.' Augustine rightly considered that that could not be said of David; but as nearly all the Fathers were in the habit of giving a spiritual or mystical meaning to such passages, Augustine thus applied it to Christ, as also did other Fathers.

155. Augustine little thought how a few hundred years after his death his unfortunate but innocent mistake in applying to Christ what really formed no part of Scripture, would be employed in defence of one of the foulest heresies which ever afflicted the Christian Church. Least of all could he conceive that a class of men would spring up in the Church who should have the hardihood to use his words in an exactly opposite sense to that which he intended. Paschasius himself set the pernicious example of so quoting the passage in question as to make it a very plausible piece of evidence that the great Augustine was a believer of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements. How well the disciples have followed the example of their master for about one thousand years their writings testify, Dr Pusey's not excepted.

156. We have yet one more instance to give of the misuse of the passage in question, and it is as striking as any. It would appear, according to Mr Shipley's account, that a hymn for Maunday Thursday has been founded upon a portion of the passage. The hymn, with the dogma on which Mr Shipley supposes it was founded, together with his remarkable conclusions therefrom, will be found 39 14, 15, which, when the reader has consulted, he may well wonder to find so much built upon a gross misrepresentation of an ancient misconception.

157. The next canon we shall notice is the 42d, entitled, 'The Confession of Berenger,' and is given chapter viii. 74 from the writings of Lanfranc. This is indeed a strange document to be placed in juxtaposition with some of the most telling passages of Augustine, most of which Dr Pusey has declined to quote in his large collection of extracts from the Fathers, but some of which Berenger cited against the Paschasians (see ch. viii. 72); and what is still more strange, this confession has been placed there as testifying to the same doc-

trine on the Eucharist as that of Augustine, and the Roman Catholic glossers display their confidence in their art by professing to have brought both into harmony. Here follow several canons, preceded and followed by their respective headings and glosses, all of which it is important to examine.

158. 'What is it to eat the body of Christ and drink His blood.'

XLVI. "What is it to eat Christ? It is not only to receive His body and blood in the sacrament. For many unworthy receive, of whom saith the Apostle, He who eateth the bread and drinketh the cup of the Lord unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself. But how is Christ to be eaten? He Himself said, He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him. If he abideth in me and I in him, then he eateth, then he drinketh. But he that abideth not in me, nor I in him, although he receive the sacrament he getteth great torment." (21 139.)

159. Augustine in this case 'shows that Christ is taken in a twofold manner, namely, sacramentally and spiritually—sacramentally by the unworthy, spiritually as by the worthy, for he who eats [takes] worthily; but if he receives [takes] unworthily. Christ is eaten in two modes—in one sacramentally, which belongs to the good and bad—in another mode spiritually, when He is received through faith and love co-operating. This is only of the good. But here it is commonly asked whether the body of Christ is taken with His Soul and Divinity? H. says that the Divinity or the Soul is not there taken. Others, as B. say, by taking the body I take the Divinity and the Soul, for thou who dost receive flesh in that food, thou dost partecipate of His Divine substance. And it is better even according to theologians, for although there is not the Divinity through transubstantiation, yet it is there through concomitaney.'

160. "It is not only to receive His body."—That is the body of Christ, for although Divinity is there, and humanity, that is, soul and flesh, yet we eat or we drink daily on the altar His flesh only, once sacrificed on the cross, not Divinity, not soul. For the bread is converted into flesh only, and wine

‘into blood. *Drinketh the cup, &c.*’ ‘Whole Christ is eaten and drunk entire, not, however, the soul or Divinity, for they do not belong to eating and drinking. Whence this is granted. Whole Christ was in the sepulchre, that is, the human person, namely, according to the nature of our humanity, according to a body. This, however, is not here granted, that the whole which was Christ was in the sepulchre, for His soul was not; and so according to B., although one may take whole Christ, not, however, His soul, or living nature. “*And drinketh my blood*” by faith and charity, who, as it were, is of the unity of the Church, which my flesh and blood signify. “*Abideth in me*”—that is, he cleaves to me by love, and I, by indwelling grace, abide in him.’

161. ‘To believe in Christ is to eat and drink Christ.’

‘XLVII. “Why make ready thy teeth and belly? Believe, “and thou hast eaten.” (21 69.) “For to believe on Him —this is, to eat the living bread. He who believes on Him eats Him; invisibly is he fed, because invisibly is he born again.” (21 72.)

162. “*Why.*” It is said here that where the body of Christ cannot be had, as it is made in the sacrament, faith alone suffices; for even then one is said to eat Christ, “*Belly.*” Whence understand only: or where a supply of the Lord’s body cannot be had; but he does not forbid the Lord’s body to be received sacramentally, but that when necessity requires, there is no harm to him if he does not receive, from which, on his own account, he does not stand aloof; for since he believes, he eats spiritually, but not sacramentally.’

163. ‘How the body of Christ must be spiritually received.’

‘LIX. “To believe on Jesus Christ—this is to eat the “living bread. He who believes on Him eats, invisibly “is he fed, because he is also invisibly born again.”’ (21 72.)

164. ‘*To believe.*’ It is said in this case ‘that he who believes in Christ spiritually eats Him, and lives for ever; he does not, however, take the Lord’s body sacramentally as evil men do, but by his participation is made a member of

‘ Christ, and is fed by His Spirit, and he approaches to God, to whom evil men do not come. “ *He who believes on Him* “ *eats, &c.*” By loving Him above all things, namely, by trusting that He will be given to himself for a reward, by placing entire hope in Him he incorporates Christ in himself by faith, and love, and hope.’

165. ‘ He receives the sacrament of Christ’s body, not the reality of it, who is at variance with Him.’

‘ LXV. “ He who is at variance with Christ neither eats “ His flesh nor drinks His blood, although he daily indiscriminately receive to the condemnation of his own presumption the sacrament of so great a thing.” ’ (21 21.)

166. “ *He who is, &c.*” It is said here that he who is evil does not spiritually eat, nor is he incorporated into the Church, although he daily takes sacramentally the body of Christ. “ *Nor does he eat.*” That is, he is not incorporated into His body, which is the Church, by eating—that is, by believing, although he daily takes the body which was born of the virgin, for this also wicked men receive.’

167. ‘ How the manna and water from the rock were the same with our meat and drink.’

‘ LXXXI. “ The apostle says, They all ate the same “ spiritual meat. As spiritual it was the same, as corporal “ it was another; for they ate manna—we something else “ [that is, consecrated bread] and did all drink the same “ spiritual drink. They one thing [that is, water from the “ rock] we another [that is, consecrated wine] but [other “ only] in the visible form; which, however, is the same “ thing in its spiritual virtue.” (21 77.)

168. “ *The Apostle says.*” ‘ The Apostle teaches in the Epistle to the Corinthians that our fathers did eat the same spiritual meat with us, and drank the same spiritual drink, but corporally another: for they, manna and water from the rock—we Christ’s flesh and blood, but had the same spiritual signification: the letter of the Apostle is here explained by Augustine. “ *All.*” We, as well as the fathers of the Old Testament, but dissimilarly, for they in figure—we in reality. “ *Which, however, was the same.*” That is, signifies this same thing, which that did, for they drank water from the

‘rock, which was a figure of the blood of Christ. “*Spiritual.*”
 ‘That is, according to the spiritual meaning, the same they
 ‘did eat spiritually, which we do; not that the body of Christ
 ‘was hid under the manna, as now under the sacramental
 ‘forms, but because the manna signified that.’

169. In these extraordinary self-contradictory utterances of Gratian’s glossers, or rather of the glossers of Augustine’s sentiments, we find that they have, in effect, committed the fault which Romanists so severely condemn in others. They charge those who do not admit of a real objective presence in the consecrated elements with regarding them as mere signs, empty figures, shadows without a substance; and it must be confessed that they are practically so to unworthy receivers of them, not that they are really so, but in consequence of their own unfitness they can receive nothing more than the mere signs or figures. But these glossers of the sentiments of Augustine have placed the unworthy communicant in the very position in which a Zwinglian would place him. In each case the reception is only sacramental, is by the natural mouth only, and there is no intrinsic difference in regard to what is received by each. One receives bread only, the other receives body or flesh only—at least so these glossers teach. In regard to the mode of reception, and what is received by the worthy communicant, the difference is small indeed. Both are said to receive spiritually, and what is so received is not necessarily in the bread in the one case or in the flesh in the other; and in fact in neither case is what is said to be received, received by the natural mouth at all, but by faith. The effects of receiving the bread or the flesh in regard to the unworthy communicant are precisely the same, and so are the effects and mode of receiving what is spiritual and efficacious. In neither case is the real spiritual and efficacious participation confined necessarily to the visible elements, for this may take place without them, as the body and blood of Christ in both cases can be efficaciously eaten and drunk by faith only, without the consecrated elements. The main difference between these Roman Catholic glossers and a Zwinglian is as to what is received by the mouth of the unworthy communicant; and yet even here there is no essential difference—the one receiving flesh, which is supposed

to be already transubstantiated bread, bread which has been made into flesh; the other receiving bread which is really made into flesh after reception. But, strictly speaking, wholesome bread does not require to be transubstantiated to become flesh, as it already contains the substance of flesh, and therefore needs no change of substance to become flesh; the word 'made' then better expresses what the Romanists really mean. Even if we admit that the Roman Catholic priest, or any similar pretender, by pronouncing the words, 'For this is my 'body,' makes the bread into the flesh in which our blessed Lord condescended to tabernacle, even then it is maintained that the flesh thus made is not intrinsically different from the flesh which is really made of the bread received by the communicant; and, as far as we can learn from these glosses, the effects in either case are the same. Augustine himself plainly teaches that the flesh of Christ of itself profits nothing; it is rather what He did in the flesh for our sakes that really profits (21 88); and it is that only which is received to any real profit in the Lord's Supper through the consecrated elements, and can only be received by the believing communicant.

170. We shall now give a brief review of the attempt as made in the glosses to reconcile the plain teaching of Augustine with the errors of Paschasius in regard to the real presence. At the commencement (sec. 159) we probably have the origin of the worthless expedient resorted to by Dr Pusey, by way of making it appear that although Augustine had said that the wicked eat not the body of Christ, yet he considered that they really received it, as they certainly must if it is in the consecrated elements. The gloss then gives us to understand that the unworthy receive into their mouth and stomach the real flesh of Christ which was born of Mary, which certainly seems very much like eating of it; but yet they are considered not to eat but only to receive it, whereas the worthy communicant not only thus receives but also eats the body. So far the gloss and Dr Pusey appear to agree; but we learn from the gloss what we do not learn from Dr Pusey, that this eating is not by the mouth at all, nor does what is thus eaten enter by the mouth; and, consequently, that which the worthy communicant is said to eat, is not even received by the unworthy

communicant. Thus we are taught that the body of Christ can be eaten by faith without the sacrament, and cannot be eaten by the wicked with the sacrament. (Sec. 162.) So that what is thus received is not located in what can be received by the mouth. Again, in the words of Augustine, 'He who believes on Christ, eats;' the gloss shows how the believer eats, viz., 'by loving Him above all things (namely) by trusting that He will be given to Himself for a reward, by placing entire hope in Him he incorporates Christ in himself by faith, and love, and hope.' (Sec. 164.) It is not pretended that what the believer is thus said to eat is even received by the unworthy communicant. Augustine plainly says that he who is at variance with Christ neither eats His flesh nor drinks His blood (Sec. 165)—descriptive of which sentiments Gratian very properly says, 'He receives the sacrament of Christ's body, not the reality of it, who is at variance with Him.' (Sec. 165.) That is, the wicked receive the sacrament or sign, but not that which is signified by it. How this is the gloss tells us. 'He is not incorporated into His body, which is the Church, by eating—that is, by believing.' (Sec. 166.) Again, we are told that the drinking of the blood of Christ is done by faith, and by one who is of the unity of the Church. (Sec. 160.) Here we learn not only from Augustine, but from these Paschasian glossers, that the unworthy do not even receive what the worthy eat. So that when Dr Pusey says, 'Augustine does not deny, he even affirms, that "those who eat and drink unworthily receive the body of Christ in the sacrament," but do not eat Christ,' (*The Real Presence*, &c., pp. 273, 274), he is really imposing on his unlearned readers; for the unworthy do not even receive that which the worthy are said to eat, at least not according to the plain teaching of Augustine, and as is here admitted even by his glossers. He distinctly teaches that the unworthy only eat the sacrament, but not the great thing of which it is a sacrament (Sec. 165), which Gratian explains thus—'He receives the sacrament of Christ's body, not the reality.' (Sec. 165.) We have already seen how these glossers explain a Eucharistic sign or sacrament—that is, a form of bread under or in which is the body of Christ, and this body is again a figure, sign, or sacrament of something external to itself.

171. In a gloss on one of the above canons we have a striking instance of the outrageous manner in which the idea is carried out. Augustine had occasion to point out the analogy between the sacraments of the Church in the wilderness and those of the Christian Church. Both had things corporal and things spiritual; in what was corporal they differed, in what was spiritual they were alike (Sec. 167.) Now, observe what the glosser says on this point. 'Our fathers did eat the same spiritual meat with us, and drank the same spiritual drink; but corporally another; for they, manna and water from the rock, we, Christ's flesh and blood, but had the same spiritual signification.' (Sec. 168.) Here we see that the corporal things in the one case were manna and water, in the other Christ's real flesh and blood, but the latter had the same spiritual signification as the former. This sapient glosser to suit his doctrine would make Christ's real flesh and blood into figures or signs, as corporal and as devoid of that of which they are supposed to be the signs or figures, as were the manna and water which no one pretends contained the things of which they were the signs or figures. But Augustine brings the corporal things of the one into still closer proximity to the corporal things of the other, of which the glosser takes no notice. He asserts distinctly that the corporal things of our sacraments differ only in the *visible* form (Sec. 167), from the corporal things of the sacraments of the Church in the wilderness. That the manna and water in the one case, and the consecrated bread and wine in the other, differ only in visible form is intelligible enough, and that is really what Augustine means. In his time it was the universal practice not to mention bread and wine in connection with the Lord's Supper before the uninitiated. Romanists do not consider Christ's flesh and blood to be ordinarily visible in the Eucharist, and some Romanists deny that they are corporal things, they rather consider them to be present after the manner of a spirit, and in that sense spiritual. Nothing could well be more contemptible than this attempt at reconciling the teaching of Augustine with that of Paschasius. How Augustine has described the analogy between the sacraments of the former dispensation and the present is fully noticed (ch. xi. 7),

from which it may be seen how impossible it is to reconcile the doctrine of Augustine with the more modern doctrine of Romanists and others in regard to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. How Bertram thought and wrote on this point may be seen **25 11-16**.

172. The glosses given above, made originally with the intent of bringing the doctrine of Augustine into harmony with the more modern doctrine, exhibit but a fraction of the superhuman difficulty of harmonizing the two. They have only been partially noticed, but we beg the reader to consider them well. Wretched as is the attempt at reconciliation, it is the result of the combined and cumulative thought of able Romanists during some centuries, and perhaps it is as good a one as ever has been made, or ever will be. Dr Pusey's partial attempt at reconciliation, even as far as it goes, is an utter failure.

CHAPTER X.

A MORE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE FATHERS IN REGARD TO THEIR USE OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE WHICH THEY COMMONLY USE IN RELATION TO THE EUCHARIST, AND A FULL EXAMINATION OF THE GENERAL RULES ACCORDING TO WHICH THEIR LANGUAGE MUST BE INTERPRETED. THE ANCIENT DEFINITION OF A SACRAMENT, AS GIVEN BY AUGUSTINE, CONSIDERED AND COMPARED WITH THAT OF THE POST-REFORMATION, AS GIVEN IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND CATECHISM. DR PUSEY'S MISREPRESENTATION AND MISAPPLICATION OF THE MODERN DEFINITION WHICH IS SHOWN TO BE ZWINGLIAN IN ITS ORIGIN. THE FACT THAT THE FATHERS, LIKE THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, COMMONLY CALL SIGNS AND SACRAMENTS BY THE NAMES OF THE THINGS OF WHICH THEY WERE THE SIGNS AND SACRAMENTS CONFIRMED AND FULLY ILLUSTRATED. THE DISPOSAL OF DR PUSEY'S SLENDER EXPEDIENT TO FOUND HIS DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE ON A FEW SACRAMENTAL PHRASES, SUCH AS 'IN' THE BREAD, 'IN' THE TYPE, ETC., CULLED OUT OF THE FATHERS, AND THE LITTLE WORD 'IN' DULY ITALICISED. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE FATHERS GENERALLY SPEAK OF THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS AS TYPES, SYMBOLS, SACRAMENTS, ANTITYPES, SIGNS, ETC., CONSIDERED TO BE ALIKE FATAL TO THE MODERN ROMAN THEORY OF THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS, AND TO THE THEORY OF DR PUSEY, WITH AN EXPOSURE OF THE ASSUMPTION THAT SUCH SYMBOLICAL WORDS AS THOSE ABOVE MIGHT REALLY BE, OR CONTAIN THE THINGS WHICH THEY SIGNIFY OR REPRESENT. THE PHRASE, 'UNDER THE FORM OF BREAD AND WINE,' IN ITS EARLIEST USE SHOWN NO MORE TO TEACH OR TO IMPLY A REAL PRESENCE IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS THAN SUCH PHRASES AS, 'IN THE TYPE OF BREAD,' 'UNDER THE VEIL, IMAGE, OR COVERING OF BREAD,' ETC., OF WHICH IT IS THE EQUIVALENT. THE WORD 'FORM' IN THE ABOVE SENTENCE, AS USED BY ROMAN CATHOLICS TO DENOTE UNSUBSTANTIALITY, OR A MERE APPEARANCE WITHOUT REALITY, SHOWN TO BE CONTRARY TO ALL ANTIQUITY. THE ASSUMPTION OF DR PUSEY AND SIR ROBERT PHILLIMORE THAT BECAUSE BERTRAM USED SUCH PHRASES IN RELATION TO THE SACRAMENTAL ELEMENTS, AS 'UNDER THE FORM,' 'UNDER THE VEIL,' 'UNDER THE COVERING,' ETC., HE MUST HAVE BELIEVED THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD TO BE IN THOSE ELEMENTS, EXAMINED AND REFUTED. IT IS ALSO SHOWN THAT IF, AS IS ADMITTED, THE ENGLISH LEADING REFORMERS WERE DISCIPLES OF BERTRAM, THEY COULD NOT HAVE HELD, AS SIR ROBERT PHILLIMORE MAINTAINED THEY DO, THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS, INASMUCH AS IT IS PROVED THAT BERTRAM DID NOT HOLD THAT DOCTRINE, BUT VERY ABLY REFUTED IT. DR PUSEY'S CONCEPTION OF THE SYMBOLICAL ACTION OF THE EUCHARIST SHOWN TO BE CONTRARY TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AND THE GENERAL TEACHING OF THE FATHERS.

It is purposed in this chapter to enter upon a more critical and exact examination of the fathers respecting all the leading sentiments which have been ascribed to them by Romanists, Ritualists, and High Anglicans, in relation to the Lord's Supper. It is of essential importance, in order to a full appreciation of the teaching of these ancient authors, that we, as much as possible, put ourselves into their position, and examine their statements from their own point of view. We naturally enquire, had they any definite or acknowledged rules of interpretation. It is satisfactory to know that they had, and that some of these rules are of special importance in guiding us to a correct understanding of the real teaching of the fathers on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

2. Origen laid down certain broad principles of interpretation in order to a right understanding of certain figurative words and phrases, which are of much importance in the present controversy. Thus, in his introduction to his Commentary on Solomon's Song, by way of guarding his less learned readers from understanding that which related only to the soul as applying to the body, he shows how important it is to discriminate between what belongs to one and what belongs to the other (11. 23, 43); and in the body of the Commentary he especially shows how certain words are applied to Christ, which must not by any means be understood literally. Among other things he states, 'Christ is called the 'bread of life, that the taste of the soul may have what it may taste.' (11. 44.) He regarded 'those words which are written' in the Scriptures as 'the forms of certain sacraments 'and the images of divine things.' How this sort of sacraments and images is to be understood, he tells us elsewhere, and illustrates a case in point exactly suited to our purpose, cautioning his hearers against understanding literally the words of our Lord; 'Except ye eat my flesh and drink my 'blood,' he makes such statements as cannot fail to be understood. (11. 28, 29.) The learned Jerome shows how forms of speech are often used figuratively, and gives an important illustration bearing upon the point in hand (18 12.)

3. Basil who, although he strongly condemns allegorizing as practised by some of his brethren, (see ch. i. 41) was not

insensible to the fact that many parts of Scripture cannot admit of a literal interpretation, but must be understood spiritually, and that, although we are said to eat Christ, he explains that this can be done only spiritually. Thus he says, 'that there is a certain spiritual mouth of the inner man, by which he is nourished, receiving the Word of life, which is the bread which came down from heaven.' (16 1.) Again he says, 'We have observed in many places that the faculties of the soul are called by the same names as the external members of the body, and since our Lord is the true bread and His flesh the true meat, it is necessary that the pleasure and joy derived from that bread should accrue to us through a mental taste.' (16 2.)

4. But Augustine, more than all the early Fathers put together, has laid down certain definite principles of biblical interpretation in relation to signs, and especially sacramental signs. His treatise on Christian doctrine contains, in fact, the earliest systematic principles of biblical interpretation, and usually heads the list of those referred to in modern works of this nature. He says, 'All teaching consists of realities or signs, but realities are learned by signs.' (21 8.) This, and what we shall further cite, has an especial bearing upon the signs or sacraments in the Lord's Supper. It is necessary here to inform the unlearned reader that the modern definition of a sacrament, as given in our catechism, was unknown to Augustine, that at least he never so defines a sacrament. It is almost certain that this definition was made by Zwingle, or his followers, for it is in their writings that we first read of it. (See secs. 17-24 below.) The only distinction that Augustine made between a sign and a sacrament was that 'when signs appertain to divine things they are called sacraments.' (21 1.) Again he says, 'A visible sacrifice is a sacrament of an invisible sacrifice—that is, a sacred sign.' (21 28.) But the fullest and most formal definition is as follows:—'There is a sacrament in any celebration when a remembrance is so made of a thing done that something else also be understood to be signified, which must be spiritually understood.' (21 7.)

5. Augustine in his critical treatise, in which he especially treats on signs, says, 'Discoursing on signs,' and on signs which

‘when they appertain to divine things are called sacraments;’ he says, ‘I make this remark, that no one must fix his attention on them in what they are, but rather that they are ‘signs—that is, that they signify something. For a sign is a ‘thing which, besides the form which it presents to the senses, ‘causes something else external to itself to come into the ‘mind.’ (21 9.) Again, according to the plain teaching of Augustine, the holy signs employed in the Lord’s Supper and the sacrament of Baptism are represented as ‘visible words.’ (21 10, 39, 101.) For in the mind of Augustine sacraments thus called would no more be the things which they represent or signify than words uttered by the human voice, although they might be more impressive. He condemns, in the strongest manner possible, the pernicious practice of understanding figurative language literally, and taking the signs for the thing signified. (21 11.) He plainly ranks the sacraments of Baptism and the celebration of the Lord’s Supper among the signs which he is generally explaining, and shows that they ought not to be venerated with a carnal servitude. He states, ‘It is a mark of vile bondage to follow the letter, ‘and take the signs for the things signified by them.’ (21 12.) In the paragraph here referred to will be found a citation made by Dr Pusey, and the only one which he has thought proper to make from this most important little treatise of Augustine. The reader has only to examine what goes before, and what comes after Dr Pusey’s citation to make him wonder how he could venture to tell his readers that he had fairly treated the testimony of the Fathers, (35 41) and how he could catch at such a faint, if not extremely doubtful admission of Dean Goode for his supposed fair conduct in this respect. (35 53.)

6. But nothing could be more fatal to Romanists and Romanizers than an important rule laid down by Augustine, and especially the text on which he founds it, and which will be seen. (21 13.) It should be observed that Augustine does not explain the text, ‘Except ye eat the flesh and drink the ‘blood of the Son of God,’ &c., by his rule, but founds his rule upon it, plainly showing that in his opinion no one could take that text literally, for to eat the flesh of Christ and drink His

blood would be a disgraceful thing or a crime, and that no one in Augustine's day could understand Christ otherwise than as teaching 'us to communicate in the passion of the Lord, and 'sweetly and profitably to treasure up in our memory that His 'flesh was crucified and wounded for us.' The legitimate and direct application of this rule and the interpretation of this text to the words of institution in the Lord's Supper are too obvious to need dwelling upon. (See ch. viii. 50.) Augustine could not openly, before the uninitiated in mysteries, apply the rule in question to the words of institution, for obvious reasons which we have already noticed. (See ch. ix. 23-26.) In this important treatise on Christian Doctrine, Augustine represents true believers as being the real body of Christ, that of which the consecrated bread was the sign. (21 16, 17.) Elsewhere he instructs a catechist how he is to understand the signs which represent divine realities, and that even in the Scriptures anything which has a carnal sound, although he does not understand it, yet he must believe that something spiritual is signified. (21 26.)

7. In one of his discourses he descants on certain metaphors applied to Christ, showing that He is often called that which He is not really. Thus he says, 'Rock is called rock, 'and it is not rock, for it signifies another thing. . . . In 'the rock we recognize firmness, and we understand Christ as 'the rock . . . "and the rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4). 'Rock then, in proper signification, is blameable. He who 'shall say that the rock was Christ in proper signification 'blasphemes.' (21 121, 122.) Elsewhere he says, 'Nor 'think, brethren, that the sun ought to be worshipped, by 'some men, because the sun doth sometimes in the Scriptures signify Christ. For such is the madness of men, as if 'we said that a creature should be worshipped, when it is 'said, the sun signifies Christ. Then worship the rock also, 'for it signifies Christ.' (21 62.) Now, Augustine, as we shall have occasion to notice, most certainly, in various parts of his writings, maintains that the rock sacramentally to Israel was exactly what the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper are to us, and the same in mystery. (21 53.) It was the same spiritual meat (21 77), and the same spiritual

drink. (21 94.) “For the rock was Christ.” Therefore ‘they drank the same drink as we do, but spiritual; that is, ‘that which is taken by faith, not that which is drunk by ‘the body.’ (21 112.)

8. According to the most clear and unquestionable teaching of Augustine, we might affirm the very same things of the consecrated bread and wine in the sacrament as he affirms of the rock. Ælfric, one of our own archbishops, as we have seen, actually associates bread as a metaphor of Christ with the other metaphors adduced by Augustine, and interprets it after the same manner. (Ch. ix. 26.) In the phraseology of Augustine we might say, ‘Cup, or the wine contained in it, is ‘called blood, and it is not blood. “This is my blood,” ‘blood in proper signification is blameable. He who shall ‘say that wine is the blood of Christ in proper signification ‘blasphemes.’ (21 121, 122.)

9. We have now to notice lastly, in relation to the patristic principles of interpretation, a very important canon adopted by Augustine, and commended to his brethren. He says, ‘Brethren, I must convey to you what you may hold, as a ‘rule, in the interpretation of all Scripture. Every thing ‘that is said or done, is to be understood either in its literal ‘signification, or else it signifies something figuratively; or at ‘least contains both of these at once, both its own literal ‘interpretation and a figurative signification also. Thus I ‘have set forth three things, examples of them shall now be ‘given, and from whence but from the Holy Scriptures.’ (See for the rules 21 128, 129.)

10. Augustine teaches that all Scripture must be interpreted by these rules. It is interesting to ascertain by which of them he would interpret the words of institution in the Lord’s Supper. Let us see how the first rule applies to the words in question: (1) Literally. ‘This is my body; this is ‘my blood.’ ‘Take all this as spoken in the proper sense, ‘and look not out for figures; as it is expressed, so it really ‘is. . . . It is a fact which he tells you; a simple fact ‘according to its literal meaning.’ Dr Pusey and all Romanists profess to take these words literally, and this rule of Augustine must be the one they must follow. But it is

quite certain that Augustine did not, and could not interpret the words in question by this his first rule, for as one instance out of a multitude, he says, 'For the Lord did not hesitate to say, "This is my body," when He gave a sign of His body.' The circumstances under which he made the statement, and the requirements of his argument, give peculiar force to his words. He is arguing with a Manichean who did not accept the books of Moses as the Word of God; having to establish the figurative interpretation of a text, he lays down this rule, 'A thing which is a sign is accustomed to be called by the name of the thing which it signifies.' (21 23.) And as an instance and proof of this rule he states, 'For the Lord did not hesitate to say, "This is my body," when He gave a sign of His body.' (21 35, 36.)

11. Augustine's second rule, and that only, is the one by which he could interpret the words of institution. 2dly, Figuratively, "'This is my body," "This is my blood," is 'spoken in a figure.' (21 129.)

12. 3dly, Both literally and figuratively (21 130), "'This is my body," "This is my blood," are literal facts, and which 'also signify something else figured by them.' Romanists who believe the doctrine of transubstantiation must follow this rule of Augustine, unless they reject his rules altogether. Both Lanfranc, Bellarmine, and the Roman canons appear to follow it. (See secs. 65, 66 below, and ch. ix. 140, 141.)

13. This is but a specimen of the patristic principles of interpretation; but it will be sufficient to guide us in our subsequent investigations. In this controversy it is of essential importance for the unlearned reader to know how the early Fathers defined a sacrament or mystery which will be found wholly different from the modern and post-Reformation one. The definition by Augustine, and recognized by the Schoolmen, was, 'a sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing.' (21 1, 7, 28.) This definition of a sacrament was employed by Berenger in the twelfth century in defence of the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper against the heretical disciples of Paschasius. (See ch. viii. 75.) Bellarmine, accepting this definition of Augustine, states, 'These definitions are collected from Augustine, who wrote thus, "a sacrifice is a visible sacrament of an

“invisible sacrifice,” that is, “it is a sacred sign,” in the ‘tenth book of his City of God, chap. 5, and they are common among Catholics.’ (*De Sacra.* lib. i., cap. xi., tom. iii., col. 35.) Respecting the same definition, the Catechism of the Council of Trent states, ‘There is none shows it more fully and clearly than S. Austin’s definition, which all the school doctors after him have followed.’

14. The Hon. W. E. Gladstone in his book entitled ‘Church Principles,’ has noticed the difference between the ancient and modern definition of a sacrament. He says, ‘There is, indeed, an important verbal question which may be raised on the meaning of the word sacrament, which appears to exhibit considerable diversity of sense. For instance, we find St Augustine writes thus—“It is possible for a man to receive “the sacrament of the Eucharist against his will.” *In Joan. Tract* xxvi. And again, “Let all this, I say, hereunto avail “us, my dearly beloved, that we eat not the flesh and blood “of Christ only, in the sacrament, which thing do also many “evil men.” (21 91.) It appears, from a great variety of passages, that he uses the term most commonly as denoting ‘the sign alone.’ (p. 164.)

15. Before proceeding further in this controversy, it is essential to have a proper understanding respecting Augustine’s definition of a sacrament, and the one given in our Catechism. The fact is, that Ritualists and High Anglicans and their advocates make this difference, which is but verbal, into a real difference. The Right Hon. Sir Robert Phillimore, in his judgment in the Bennett case, stated, ‘I have now to consider whether these opinions contravene the Formularies of the Church, as contained in the passages set forth in the 28th Article of charge. The authority upon which our Church principally relied in her Formularies with respect to the sacraments was that of S. Augustine. His authority is especially referred to in the Articles; portions of which are, indeed, almost translations from his works; and Overall made the definition of S. Augustine, as subsequently moulded by the schoolmen, the basis of the doctrine on the sacrament contained in our Catechism.’ (*Judgment Shepherd v. Bennett*, pp. 26, 27.) Then in a footnote he adds, ‘One of Augus-

‘tine’s definitions of a sacrament, and that definition as moulded by a schoolman, Peter Lombard, is as follows:—
 “Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii Sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum est. *Augustin.* (21 28.) Sacramentum est sacræ rei signum. Dicitur tamen sacramentum etiam sacrum secretum, sicut sacramentum divinitatis; ut sacramentum sit sacrum signans: sed nunc agitur de sacramento secundum quod est signum. Item, sacramentum est invisibilis gratiæ visibilis forma.” (*Lombard.*)

16. That the humblest reader may see whither the argument of his Lordship tends, the case shall be more fully and plainly stated. Augustine’s definition translated is, ‘Therefore, a visible sacrifice is a sacrament of an invisible sacrifice, that is a sacred sign.’ (21 28.) That definition as moulded by Lombard, is, ‘A sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing. . . . A sacrament is a visible form of invisible grace.’ Such is Augustine’s definition of a sacrament, and Lombard’s moulding of the same. It remains to be shown what his Lordship says Overall based upon this definition as thus moulded. It is contained in the part of the Catechism commonly ascribed to Overall. ‘There are two parts in a sacrament, the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace.’ Could his lordship, or one of the most ingenious of his profession instruct us how a sacrament so plainly defined as being one thing, that is a sign, could be a logical basis for its being defined as consisting of two things, that is, not only a sign, but being also another thing, viz., that which it signifies? In this case the moulding of Peter Lombard is innocent enough. But it should be noted well that the testimony of Augustine or any other Father, when moulded by another, is destroyed. The very idea of accepting religious testimony as moulded by the very ingenious wit of Lombard is perilous in the extreme. But if the testimony of Augustine may be accepted as moulded by one man, it may just as well be accepted as moulded by another. Thus Augustine, as moulded by Paschasius, Dr Pusey, or any of the school of Paschasius, would be made to teach the comparatively modern doctrine of the real Presence.

17. Perhaps the intelligent divine will assert, that after all the difference between Augustine’s definition of a sacrament

and the definition given in the Catechism is merely verbal and not real. True. But Mr Bennett, his master Dr Pusey, and his defender, who ought to have been his impartial judge, so understand and interpret the definition of the Catechism as to make an essential difference, and not merely a verbal one. With them, the outward visible part (the bread, for instance, in the Lord's Supper) by consecration becomes, or is made to contain, the inward part; that is, the real body of Christ. To claim the authority of Augustine, however indirectly, for this sort of thing is a reflection on that illustrious Father. He formally and repeatedly defined a sacrament in the fourth century as '*a sign of a sacred thing*,' and generally uses the word in the sense thus defined, and in no other. Lombard in the 12th century did not include in his definition of a sacrament the thing signified in the sacrament, Overall in the 16th century defined in a most formal manner a sacrament to be a sign of a sacred thing, and also to include the thing signified. This last definition is grossly misinterpreted by Mr Bennett and his school, so as to teach that the outer parts or signs of the Lord's Supper by consecration become, or are made to contain, the real body and blood of Christ, and respecting this definition so interpreted, Mr Bennett's judge and defender says, 'Overall made the definition of S. Augustine, as subsequently moulded by the schoolmen, the basis of 'the doctrine on the sacrament contained in the Catechism,' and thus, in an indirect manner, his Lordship claims the great name and sanction of Augustine for the doctrine of Dr Pusey and his disciple Mr Bennett. How grievously the sentiments of Augustine are misrepresented as well as the definition of a sacrament in the Catechism perverted, remains now to be shewn.

18. The definition of a sacrament is the most modern part of the Formularies, and it is certain, that most, if not all, the other instances where it, or its equivalent, mystery, occurs, can only admit of the ancient definition, and not of the modern. In such cases, for example, as the phrases, 'Do eat and drink 'the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.' (Art. xxix.) 'Hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love, and for a continual remembrance of His death.' (*Exhortation in the Communion Service*.)

19. The modern definition of a sacrament conveniently misunderstood or misrepresented by Dr Pusey and his friends, forms one of their cleverest expedients to mystify, and in fact, deceive their unlearned and too simple followers. Let the reader note well the use Dr Pusey makes of this post-Reformation nomenclature. Thus he says, 'It is quite true that 'the *outward* elements are a figure of the *inward* substance.' (35 31.) Again he says, 'The sacrament of the Holy Eucharist having two parts, an *inward* and an *outward*, and that 'it is an assumption to say that the *outward* symbol is the 'figure of an absent body of our Lord.' (35 32.) Dr Pusey here assumes that the symbol is not only the figure of the body of Christ, but is, or has become, without changing its substance, the real body of Christ, and that whoever takes the symbol by the mouth, takes also the body of Christ after the same manner. Dr Hamilton, the late bishop of Salisbury has very fully stated the same views. (38 15.)

20. Both Dr Pusey and Mr Makonochie, as we have seen (ch. v.1-6), adduce the formation of the first man as an illustration of the nature of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in regard to what is outward and what is inward. Dr Pusey looks upon man's formation into flesh in that state as corresponding to the unconsecrated elements in the Lord's Supper; but when God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life he became a living soul without ceasing to be flesh; but the flesh, the outward part, actually contains the soul, the invisible part; and so the elements, after consecration, without ceasing to be what they were, actually become, or contain within them, the inward part, viz., the body and blood of Christ. But this is practically a misrepresentation of the definition of a sacrament as given in the Catechism. We are not taught that the outward part of the sacrament contains the inward as the body of a man contains his soul; the explanation given forbids any such idea—most certainly does not teach it. In the sacrament of Baptism, water is the outward visible sign, and a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, is the inward and spiritual grace; but this grace is not in the water, but in the soul of him who rightly receives the sign. In the sacrament of the Lord's Supper the outward part or

sign is bread and wine ; the inward part, or thing signified, that is, the inward and spiritual grace, is not in the outward part, or sign of bread and wine, any more than in the water ; and the faithful communicant is not said to receive the inward part, or thing signified—that is, the inward and spiritual grace in the outward part or sign,—the bread and wine, but in the Lord's Supper. The mouth receives only the outward sign ; the soul, only the inward and spiritual grace. Now, Dr Pusey finds it convenient to assume that, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the outward part, after consecration, contains with or within itself the inward part, so that whoever receives the one receives the other also.

21. But this modern definition of a sacrament does not favour Dr Pusey, but is very much against him, especially if explained and understood as it was by those who first made it. It is, in fact, of post-Reformation origin, and is more especially employed by Zwingle and his followers, who, in all probability, first brought it into use. Zwingle himself appears not to have approved of the ancient definition of a sacrament, viz., that it is a sign of a sacred thing, especially in relation to the Lord's Supper. (29. 1, 2.) He considered that the symbols or signs of the Lord's Supper are only a part, and an inferior part of the sacrament ; and expressly states that 'a sacrament consists of a spiritual thing and a corporal thing.' (29. 26.) He speaks of an 'external sacrament' (29. 11), of course implying an internal one ; and of a sacrament having more parts than one, for he uses the words, 'part of the 'sacrament, although an inferior part.' 'Another part of the 'sacrament.' (29. 26.) It is needless to remark that Zwingle did not consider the corporal things, bread and wine when consecrated, to include within them the spiritual thing, namely, the body and blood ; yet he plainly taught that proper sacramental eating was not only to participate of the symbols, but of that also which they symbolised or represented. Hence he says, 'You properly eat sacramentally when you do 'the same thing inwardly which you perform outwardly.' (29. 16.)

22. From the teacher we pass to his disciples, and their 'Former and Latter Confessions' as published in the 'Harmony

‘of Protestant Confessions,’ of which there were twelve, the Confession of the Church of England, drawn up by Bishop Jewel, forming one of them. We are told, then, in the Zwinglian confession, that—

‘Sacraments be mystical symbols, or holy rites, or sacred actions, ordained of God Himself, consisting of His word, of outward signs, and of things signified As in Baptism; the outward sign is the element of water, and that visible washing which is done by the minister. But the thing signified is regeneration and the cleansing from sins. Likewise, in the Lord’s Supper, the outward sign is bread and wine; but the thing signified is the body of Christ which was given, and His blood which was shed for us, and the communion of the body and blood of the Lord Not that the signs are turned into the things signified, or cease to be what in their own nature they are (for then they could not be sacraments, which should consist only of the thing signified, and have no signs); but therefore do the signs bear the names of the things, because they be mystical tokens of holy things, and because the signs and the things signified are sacramentally joined together; joined together, I say, or united by a mystical signification, and by the purpose and will of Him who first instituted them.’—*Confession of Helvetia*, ch. xix. 282-286.

23. Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli, and who probably drew up the confession, has recorded the same sentiments in his ‘Decades,’ consisting of fifty sermons. He frequently states in his sermons on the sacraments that

‘Sacraments consist of two things, the sign and the thing signified; and that the sign and thing signified are joined together in the sacraments by God’s institution, by faithful contemplation and use; to be short, in signification and likeness of the things; but I utterly deny that these two are naturally united together, so that the sign in the sacrament beginneth to be that which the thing signified is in its own substance and nature; I deny that the thing signified is joined corporally with the sign, so that the sign remaineth still in its own substance and nature, and yet, nevertheless, in the meantime, hath the thing signified corporally joined unto it; that thereby who-soever is partaker of the sign, should also by the sign or with the sign be partaker of the thing itself.’ *The fifth Decade, Sermon vi.*, vol. iv., p. 279.

24. How closely the Church of England identified herself with Bullinger’s sentiments, as expressed in these sermons, is seen from the fact that Convocation in 1586 required ministers to read over one of the sermons every week, taking notes, and shewing them to a licensed preacher every quarter.

It is scarcely credible that the slanderers of Zwingle and his followers should turn to their own account their definition of a sacrament, and employ it as if it were hoar with antiquity, but employ it not as it was employed by its authors to elucidate truth, but by a misinterpretation and misapplication to obscure it. It appears to be an historical fact that the Zwinglian Reformers were the first and only ones who so defined the sacraments.

25. We shall do well to consider the use and application of the word sacrament as employed by the Fathers, adhering to their own definition of the word. With the ancients, sacraments, instead of being numbered by seven, might be numbered by seventy and seven. Jerome speaks of the Scriptures as being full of sacraments. (18 16.) Some of the Fathers, and especially Augustine, with some degree of distinctness, restrict the word to the rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. (21 6.) But of these two rites they made not two but four sacraments. Rabanus, in the middle of the ninth century, in his instruction to the clergy represents the sacraments as four, Thus he says, 'Baptism and Chrism, Body 'and Blood are sacraments.' (26 18.) Bertram does the same thing, and cites Isidore, an earlier writer, as his authority. (25 25.)

26. It is important to notice that sacraments, commonly defined by the ancients as 'signs of sacred things,' take the names of the sacred things of which they are the signs; thus in the sacrament of Chrism the consecrated oil is said to be the gift of Christ (15 11), not that it really is so, but signifies or represents it. (See ch. viii. 67.) The fact that both in Holy Scripture, and in the writings of the Fathers, sacraments or signs of holy things, commonly take the names of the things of which they are the sacraments or signs, is one which both Romanists and Romanizers have greatly turned to their own account, and more especially by assuming that the word sacrament in relation to the Lord's Supper is really and actually what it is commonly called—viz., the body and blood of Christ.

27. It remains that we now adduce against them the undoubted testimony of antiquity. Augustine is our most

able and competent witness, who in various parts of his voluminous writings has expressed himself most clearly on this point. The passages will be cited or referred to in the order in which they stand in his writings. The most important and full passage is the second which occurs, and to which only we can refer the reader. (21 2, 3.) Here it will be seen how Baptism is spoken of, as if it were burial with Christ, whereas it was not really so, therefore Augustine remarks, 'The sacrament of so great a thing he called by no other name than that of the thing itself.' To illustrate and confirm the point he had in hand among other things, he expressly asserts, 'That sacraments for the most part receive the names even of the things themselves. As, therefore, after a certain manner the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ.'

28. Again he says, 'Nor may it be denied that sometimes the thing which signifies, receives the name of that thing which it signifies. . . . For so also was the rock called Christ, because it signifies Christ.' (*Epist. cii. ad Evodium*, tom. ii. p. 173.) He yet adds, 'A thing which is a sign is accustomed to be called by the name of the thing which it signifies; as it is written, "The seven ears are seven years;" for he did not say they "signify seven years;" and "the seven kine are seven years;" and many things of this kind. Hence there is that which is said, "The Rock was Christ," For he did not say, "the rock signified Christ," but as it were, was this very thing, though indeed it was not this in substance, but in signification.' (21 23, Bede 24 24. See also 21 31.) He further states in proof that although blood is called life it is not really so, that 'the Lord did not hesitate to say, "This is my body," when He gave a sign of His body. . . . For the blood was so life as the rock was Christ. Thus the apostle says, "For they drank of that rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ." . . . He did not, however, say the rock signified Christ, but said, "the rock was Christ." (21 35, 36.)

29. Finally, he says, 'It is not said the rock signified Christ, but "the rock was Christ:" neither is it said,

'the good seed signifies the children of the kingdom, or, the tares signify the children of the wicked one, but it is said, "The good seed, these are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one." As then Scripture is wont to speak, calling the things signifying as 'if they were the things signified.' (21 100, Bede 24 24.) Here, beyond all question, according to Augustine, signs, and sacraments which he calls sacred signs, do commonly take the names of the things which they signify, not that they become so in nature or substance, but by signification. What is most important to our argument is, that in these citations from Augustine we have two instances taken from the words of institution in illustration and confirmation of signs and sacraments taking the names of those things which they signify. (21 3, 35.) Romanists and Romanizers rest their doctrine of the Real Presence mainly upon the words of institution being taken literally, that the bread did not represent or signify Christ's body, or was a memorial of it, but according to Dr Pusey it actually was His body; whereas Augustine states, 'our Lord did not hesitate to say "this is my body," when He gave a sign of His body.' Nothing could be more fatal to Paschasian assumptions.

30. It is essential to Dr Pusey's doctrine that a real presence should be *in* the elements after consecration, and that whoever receives the elements receives the real presence supposed to be *in* them. We have now to point out one of his attempts to prove this from the language of the Fathers. What he has said on this point will be found (35 20, 33.) It should be noticed how the little word 'in' is rendered important, imposing, and impressive, by being set off in italics. Dr Pusey often has recourse to very slender expedients for proving his doctrine to his followers, and for concealing from them the real teaching of the Fathers. The instance before us is very striking. The five Fathers who are included in the list which we have undertaken to examine are Tertullian, Cyprian, Cyril, Chrysostom, and Augustine.

31. The statements of Tertullian are, '*In* the bread is understood His body.' (35 20.) 'He consecrated His blood *in* wine.' (35 33.) The first extract with its context

will be found (10 2.) This in no respect answers the purpose for which Dr Pusey has cited it, and does not favour his doctrine, but is exactly against it. Tertullian, regarding the words 'daily bread' of the Lord's Prayer as a title of Christ to illustrate and confirm this idea, makes two citations from the sixth of St. John where Christ calls Himself, or is called Bread. No one pretends that therefore Christ is really bread. Tertullian referred to the phrase, 'This is my body,' as an additional proof that Christ represented Himself as bread or called Himself such. (See ch. xi. 45.) He is not referring to the sacramental bread, but rather to that which the sacramental bread signified—the reality rather than the sign, as his argument required, and as the context shows, for he says, 'Wherefore in praying for "daily bread," we pray to be perpetually in Christ, and undivided from His body.' (10 2.) The phrase, 'In the bread is understood His body,' is peculiar, but elsewhere it is shown to be one of several synonymous phrases which he commonly uses when speaking of signs as signifying or representing other things. (Ch. xi. 56.)

32. Is it credible that Dr Pusey could believe that Tertullian, when he said, 'In the bread is understood His body,' actually meant that Christ was really *in* the bread and not figuratively represented by it? And believe it, too, in the face of such evidence to the contrary as he himself has cited? We cannot but notice in passing how fatal to the doctrine of transubstantiation is the distinct testimony of this leading Latin Father of the century in which he lived. Tertullian in various parts of his writings repeatedly and emphatically states that Christ called His body bread. If he and some other Fathers taught this doctrine at all, it was that Christ changed His body into bread, and not bread into His body. (Ch. xi. 45-47.) The word translated 'understood' as used by Tertullian assuredly does not necessarily help Dr Pusey or his school. Elsewhere Tertullian, in his *Treatise on Patience*, uses the same word, citing the words 'Blessed are the meek,' he says, '*Under* this word, surely, the impatient cannot be 'understood.' (*censeri*), (cap. xi. p. 133.) Again, 'What now, 'if Christ be understood (*censetur*) in Daniel by this very 'title of "Son of man?"' (*Adver. Marcion*, lib. iv. cap. x.

p. 412.) Surely by using the word in question he did not intend to teach us, that impatient men were actually *under* the word meek, or that Christ was really *in* Daniel. No more from the use of that word does Tertullian teach that Christ was really *in* the bread. Cyprian, Tertullian's disciple and countryman, speaking of the element of water in the Lord's Cup, which he considered to be as essential as wine in it, says, '*In* the water the people are understood.' (12 6.)

33. The other extract which Dr Pusey makes from Tertullian is, 'He consecrated His blood *in* wine.' The context which will be found, (10 14.) the most important part of which Dr Pusey for some reason or other omits, makes all quite plain. There Tertullian represents the garments and clothes of the prophecy as figuring the flesh of Christ, and the wine of the same prophecy as signifying His blood. But in the fulfilment the figure is reversed. 'So 'now too He hath consecrated His blood *in* wine, who then 'figured wine *in* blood.' (10 14.) Tertullian no more here teaches by his figurative language, that the blood of Christ was really *in* wine in the Lord's Supper, than that the wine of the Lord's Supper was *in* the blood named in the prophecy. Jerome says of Melchizedek that he 'in type of Christ offered 'bread and wine, and consecrated the Christian mystery in the 'body and blood of the Saviour.' (18 3.) The words of Tertullian are no more to be taken literally than are these. The prophecy on which Tertullian founds his remarks is by many of the Fathers applied to Christ's mystical body, the body of true believers. It is so by Origen (11 20), Cyprian (12 5, 6), and Ruffinus (20 1.)

34. Dr Pusey cites Cyprian for two objects, viz., to show that in the language of the Fathers, 'the cup stands for the 'one element as much as the bread for the other,' and that under the outward veil of wine was the real presence of Christ's blood. (35 33.) Now, respecting the cup, Dr Pusey only states half of the truth. Had he given the part which he has suppressed, he could not have cited Cyprian in the manner which he has done, for his testimony would have been directly against him. The fact is, by the use of the phrase, 'the cup 'of the Lord,' the Fathers understood not only the element of

wine but the element of water also, and that as the wine represented the blood of Christ, so did the water represent the people of Christ. Cyprian himself speaks of two elements,—of water and of wine in the cup, and shows what each represents or signifies. Some Christians in his day celebrated the Lord's Supper in regard to the cup in water only; he writes to correct this mistake as may be seen (12 2-8.) Thus he says, 'The cup should be offered mixed with wine,' (12 2.) 'That the cup should be mingled with a union of wine and 'water;' 'that the cup was mixed, and that that was wine 'which He called His blood.' 'Which (people) we evidently 'see to be contained also *in* the sacrament of the cup;' 'we 'see that *in* the water the people are understood, but that *in* 'the wine is shown the blood of Christ.' (12 6.) 'The cup 'of the Lord is not water alone or wine alone. . . . In which 'sacrament also our people are shown to be united.' (12 7.) What Cyprian affirms of the water in regard to the people is stronger language, if we take it literally, than what he says of the wine in regard to the blood. We are not to believe that the people are really contained *in* the sacrament of the cup, or understand that they are really *in* the water of the cup, no more are we to believe that the real blood of Christ is in the cup. (See how Bertram applied this argument against Paschasius, 25 42-44, 58-61.) If even we take the language of Cyprian literally, he does not affirm that the blood of Christ is *in* the cup. He only speaks of blood *appearing* to be *in* the cup, and the wine as showing that the blood of Christ was shed. (12 3.) Dr Pusey's version and application are more adapted to mystify the unlearned reader than to instruct him. (35 33.) Cyprian says that 'Christ offered 'that very same thing (*hoc idem quod*) which Melchizedek 'had offered, that is, bread and wine, to wit, His body and 'blood.' (12 4.) According to the express teaching of Cyprian the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper are no more really Christ's body and blood than the bread and wine were which were offered by Melchizedek. And so taught the learned Jerome. (18 56.)

35. Another author cited by Dr Pusey is Cyril of Jerusalem. '*In* the type of bread is given to thee His body, and *in* the

'type of wine His blood.' (35 33.) All that Cyril here teaches is, that the communicants receive in the bread typically, sacramentally, or mystically, the body of Christ. It certainly is an outrageous notion to suppose that a type, an insensible type, is, or really contains the living being of which it is a type. Yet this sentiment is ascribed to Cyril, and the contemptible expedient of putting the little word 'in' into Italics is intended to impress this notion on the mind of the unlearned reader. Elsewhere Cyril expresses the very same sentiment under an analogous form of expression which could not by any possibility be made to convey the idea that the body of Christ was in the type, that is, in the consecrated bread. Citing the text as it stands in the Greek version, 'Come now and let us put wood upon His bread, and destroy 'Him out of the land of the living,' (Jer. xi. 19), he remarks in common with other Fathers, 'His body, according to the gospel, 'bore the type of bread.' (*Cateche.* xiii. 10 ; *Opera* p. 127.) We have the exact form of speech employed by the Greek Father Theodoret which is given (23 15.) Again by the same author in his commentary on Zechariah, he says, 'Zechariah 'seeth sin in type (*ἐν τύπῳ*) of a woman.' The Latin translation is, under the form of a woman.' (*Sub specie mulieris.*) *Opera*, tom. ii. p. 1618. In his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the words, 'For we are made partakers 'of Christ,' (iii. 14), he remarks, 'for we are partakers of 'death with the Lord Christ through holy Baptism, and we 'were buried with Him in the type (*ἐν τῷ τύπῳ*) of resurrection.' (Tom iii. p. 565.)

36. Ambrose states that the Israelites drank Christ *in type*. (17 6.) Are we to say with Dr Pusey, that Ambrose 'only 'expressed a real Presence under that outward veil' of water from the rock? The language of Ambrose is here identical with that of Cyril, and it is certain that it cannot bear the meaning which is put upon it. It is true Cyril, in accordance with Holy Scripture and antiquity generally, calls the sacramental bread, after consecration, the body of Christ, but he also calls the ointment after consecration, 'Christ's gift of grace' (15 11.) which Dr Pusey himself admits is not really 'Christ's 'gift of grace,' and remarks, 'It was not the Christ *itself* which

‘was Christ’s gift of grace. It was but the instrument or ‘vehicle of it. He calls the Chrism by the name of the grace ‘which it conveys.’ (35 37.) But, to be consistent with himself, he ought to believe and affirm the very same thing respecting the bread and the body of Christ.

37. We have seen that Theodoret speaks of the Chrism as a type of the Holy Ghost (23 15) as Cyril speaks of bread and wine as types of the body and blood of Christ. Augustine speaks in the same style of Chrism, using the word sacrament, as Cyril and Theodoret do the word type, he says, ‘the oil of ‘our fire is the sacrament of the Holy Ghost.’ (21 126.) But no one pretends, not even Dr Pusey himself, that Chrism, the type of, or sacrament of, the Holy Ghost was itself really the Holy Ghost. Neither Dr Pusey nor any other man ought to pretend that the consecrated bread and wine, types or sacraments of Christ’s body and blood are really, or do really contain, His body and blood.

38. The next Father whom Dr Pusey practises upon is Augustine, whom he cites as follows, still adhering to his slender expedient of using italics. ‘Our Lord Jesus Christ, ‘commended His body and blood *in* those things which are ‘out of many, reduced to some one.’ (35 20.) Again, ‘Receive ye that *in* the bread which hung upon the cross; receive ye that *in* the cup which flowed from His side.’ And again, ‘We drink His blood *under* the form and flavour of ‘wine.’ (35 33.) If the first extract from Augustine had not been garbled, but fairly given with the context as it is (21 82, 83), the reader would have seen that Augustine is rather referring to the people of Christ under the aspect of body and blood than simply to the body and blood of Christ. Augustine, it will be seen from his writings, regarded the union of Christ’s body, and that of true believers as being so complete, that he made little or no distinction between them. (See ch. xi. 93.) That he referred to the body of true believers in the citation made by Dr Pusey is beyond dispute. Thus, in the context, Augustine says, ‘By this meat and drink’ (meaning the body and blood of Christ) ‘then, He would have to be ‘understood the fellowship of His body and members, which ‘is the holy church.’ Then he goes on to state, ‘The sacra-

‘ment of this thing, that is, of the unity of the body and ‘blood of Christ.’ (21 82.) Again, he says, ‘This meat and ‘drink (still meaning Christ’s body and blood) which maketh ‘them by whom it is taken, immortal and incorruptible; to ‘wit, the very fellowship of the saints, where shall be unity, full ‘and perfect. For to this end (as also men of God who were ‘before us have understood this matter) did our Lord Jesus ‘Christ commend His body and blood *in* those things which ‘are, out of many, reduced into some one. For out of many ‘grains is several made into one, and several doth out of many ‘berries flow into one.’ (21 83.) Augustine is doubtless referring to the body of Christ’s believing people. This is put beyond all question by referring to Cyprian, one of the men of God to whom Augustine refers. In the translation of Augustine’s Tracts on St John, of which Dr Pusey was one of the editors, we are very properly referred to certain parts of Cyprian’s writings, which we have just noticed above (sec. 34), and which will be found (12 6-8.) A little further on, Augustine states, ‘We are bettered by participation of the ‘Son through the unity of His body and blood, which thing ‘that eating and drinking doth signify.’ (21 85.) In another part of his writings, he states, ‘That we be in His body, ‘under Himself the Head in His members, eating His flesh, ‘not forsaking the unity of Him.’ (21 86.) Again, ‘That ‘gathered together into His body, and made his members we ‘may be what we receive.’ (21 120.) Again, ‘if ye have well ‘received, ye are what ye have received,’ &c. (21 126.) Again, ‘“Ye are the body of Christ and His members.” If, therefore, ‘ye are the body of Christ and His members, the mystery ‘of yourselves is placed upon the Lord’s table; ye receive ‘the mystery of yourselves,’ &c. (21 136.) Lastly, and very conclusively, ‘Because Christ hath suffered for us He hath ‘commended unto us in this sacrament His own body and blood, ‘which also He hath even made us ourselves. For we have ‘been made His body; and through His mercy we are what ‘we receive. Call to mind and ye were not, and ye are ‘created. . . . You have, as it were, come to the cup of the ‘Lord, and there ye are on the table, and there ye are in the ‘cup,’ &c. (Augustine cited by Bede, 24 28.) Here may be

seen how Bede understood Augustine in reference to believers being the body of Christ.

39. The other two pretended citations from Augustine are not worthy of notice. The one, 'Receive ye that *in* the bread which hung upon the cross; receive ye that *in* the cup which flowed from His side' (35 33), we have already noticed. (See ch. viii. 41.) If Augustine ever used the phrase, it should be borne in mind, as we have just noticed above, that Augustine says, believers are *on* the table, and *in* the cup, and receive what they are.

40. The other citation is, 'We drink His blood *under* the form and flavour of wine.' (35 33.) Dr Pusey says, 'This is quoted in the sentences of Prosper.' As these sentences are all numbered, why did he not favour his readers with the number. We can find no such sentence in Prosper; but, after having spent considerable time in looking over those sentences our lot was to fall upon a passage in Bellarmine in which we are told that the words in question are neither those of Augustine nor of Prosper, but are cited by an author as those of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury.—*De Sac.*, lib. ii., cap. 24, tom. iii. col. 536.

41. Lanfranc was a rabid and unscrupulous defender of the doctrine of Paschasius, and employed the words which Dr Pusey ascribes to Augustine in answer to a passage cited from him by Berenger, which may be seen ch. viii. 73 above. What the real sentiments of Lanfranc were, may be seen in sections 72-74 of the same chapter. It will be seen presently, however, that the phrase, 'under the form of,' which is made to do so much service by Dr Pusey and his disciples in its earlier usage is only an equivalent phrase to the words 'in the type of,' 'in the image of,' &c., and affords no real help to Dr Pusey.

42. The last witness which we have to notice is Chrysostom, whom Dr Pusey cites as follows, 'This which is *in* the cup is that which flowed from the side, and thereof do we partake,' and 'the blood *in* the cup is drawn for thy cleansing from the 'undefiled side.' (35 33.) We shall only notice the first of these extracts, as the second, although classed with the first under one reference, is not there to be found, nor does Dr

Pusey give it in his Catena. His cause must be weak indeed to require garbled extracts and spurious citations. It is certain that Chrysostom, in the words of the first extract, is not referring to participation in the Lord's Supper only. In one aspect, that holy rite had reference to the past; and so Chrysostom regarded it. Thus in describing what we commonly call the act of consecration, he says, 'Since we too recounting over the cup the unspeakable mercies of God and all that *we have been made partakers of*, so we offer it and partake in 'common.' (22 19.) Here are two kinds of partaking alluded to, one not necessarily connected with the Lord's Supper, the other peculiar to it. This point has been noticed in another part of this book. (See ch. vii. 42-45.) Chrysostom goes on to say, 'This which is in the cup, is that which flowed from 'His side, and of that we are partakers.' (22 19.) Now, what does he mean by these words?

43. Dr Pusey often insists on taking the sacramental language of Scripture and of the Fathers literally. He cannot take this phrase so, and maintain that communicants really partake of the blood and water which flowed from Christ's side; and truly Chrysostom means no such thing. In plain English, he alludes to a saving participation of Christ, or the death of Christ, for he goes on to say, 'Blessing him, among other things, for the pouring out of this self-same cup, that we might not abide in error; and not only for the pouring out, but also for the imparting of it to us all.' (22. 19.) Here, doubtless, Chrysostom is speaking of Christ dying for sinners, and the saving benefits thereof imparted to all faithful communicants. But this saving participation of Christ, if received according to the teaching of the Scriptures, and as interpreted by the Fathers, must be received before coming to the Lord's Supper. Chrysostom himself, on the words, 'We are made partakers of Christ' (Heb. iii. 14), says, 'He means that we and He are become one; since He is the Head, and we the body, &c.' 'He speaks of faith, by which we subsist, and were born, and, so to speak, were made of one body with Him.' (22. 32; see also 30.) We have already noticed what Theodoret has said on the same text. See sec. 35 above.

44. Cyril is even yet more to the point : ‘ Being, therefore, ‘made “partakers of Christ,” ye are properly called christs. ‘ Now ye were made christs by receiving the antitype of the ‘ Holy Ghost, and all things were in an image wrought in ‘ you, because ye are the images of Christ.’ (15. 10.)

45. Subsequently, Dr Pusey, in a very lame attempt to answer an infinitesimal portion of Dean Goode’s valuable work on the Eucharist, alluded to this point again. This will be found 35 51. Here we are told that ‘ Facundus explains ‘ the word sacrament to be the outward visible sign,’ which, as we have already noticed, is the common definition of all antiquity, and then goes on to say, ‘ The sacrament [in that ‘ sense of the word of course] of adoption [that is, Baptism], ‘ may be called adoption, as the sacrament [in the sense explained] of His body and blood, which is in the consecrated ‘ bread and cup we call His body and blood, not that the ‘ bread is properly His body, or the cup His blood, but because they contain in them the mystery [or sacrament, as ‘ above explained] of His body and blood.’ (35 51.) Yet Dr Pusey unhesitatingly maintains that in these words Facundus attests at the same time his belief in the real objective presence : ‘ The bread and cup contain *in* them the ‘ mystery of His body and blood.’ (35 51.)

46. It should be borne in mind that the Latin Fathers constantly use the words sacrament and mystery synonymously, as may be seen in a multitude of instances in these pages. Facundus, in the most exact form of speech, maintains that the sacrament or mystery of the Lord’s Supper is no more that which it represents or signifies, than the sacrament or mystery of Baptism is that which it represents or signifies ; and that sacraments or mysteries take the names of the things which they represent or signify.

47. Dr Pusey admits, and even gives proofs, that the Fathers, such as ‘ S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, S. ‘ Macarius, Eusebius, Theodoret, Eustathius, and S. Augustine, ‘ say, as did Tertullian, that the consecrated elements are ‘ symbols, types, antitypes, figures, images of our Lord’s body ‘ and blood.’ (35. 20.) Again he says, ‘ Nothing is more ‘ natural than that the titles, type, antitype, symbol, figure,

'image, should be given to the outward part.' (35 32.) He also says that 'the Calvinist party inferred wrongly, that the 'Fathers, who used these terms, thought, with themselves, 'that the outward or visible part was an emblem, not of the 'inward part, or thing signified, but of an absent thing.' (35 32); that is, absent from, or not contained in the emblem, type, &c. Mr Shipley states nearly the same thing. (39 7.)

48. We have now to show that the party which Dr Pusey strangely calls Calvinist, and which is extremely numerous, embracing all orthodox Christians except Paschasius and those who substantially adopt his doctrine on the Lord's Supper, is right, and that Roman Catholics are wrong. What the Fathers affirm of the consecrated elements being symbols, types, &c., is as follows:—

49. IRENÆUS states: 'They who receive these antitypes, the 'body and blood of Christ.' (8 8.) CLEMENT of Alexandria: 'For is not the Lord's blood *figuratively represented* as 'wine.' (9 5.) 'The Scripture, accordingly, has named wine 'the *symbol* of the sacred blood.' (9 6.) TERTULLIAN: 'The wine which He consecrated to be a *memorial* of His 'blood.' (10 4.) 'Nor bread whereby He *represents* His own 'very body.' (10 8.) 'Calling His body bread, that hence, 'too, thou mayest at once understand that He gave to bread 'the *figure* of His body.' (10 10). 'He made His own body, 'that by saying, "This is my body," that is, the *figure* of 'my body.' (10 12.) ORIGEN: 'And this may be said of the *typical* and *symbolical* body.' (11 5.) 'Of what body 'and of what blood did He giving the *images*, both of the 'bread and the cup.' (11 48.) EUSEBIUS: 'Having received 'that we ought to celebrate the *memory* of this sacrifice on 'the table through the *symbols* of His body and blood, accord- 'ing to the laws of the New Testament.' (14 2.) 'He him- 'self delivered the symbols of the divine dispensation to His 'own disciples, bidding them make the *image* of His own 'body . . . but ordained that they should use bread as the '*symbol* of His own body.' (14 4.) 'There were also the 'secret *symbols* of the Saviour's passion.' (14 7.)

50. CYRIL of Jerusalem: 'But if God will, when in the

‘succeeding expositions of the mysteries we have entered
‘into the Holy of Holies, we shall then know the *symbol* of
‘what is there accomplished.’ (15 8.) ‘Our representation
‘was in an *image*, but our salvation in reality.’ ‘So also
‘is Baptism the *antitype* of Christ’s sufferings.’ (15 9.)
‘Now ye are made christs by receiving the *antitype* of the
‘Holy Ghost ; and all things were wrought in you, because
‘ye are images of Christ.’ (15 10.) ‘With the fullest
‘assurance let us partake as of the body and blood of Christ,
‘for in the *figure* of bread is given to thee His body, and
‘in the *figure* of wine His blood.’ (15 12.) ‘We are bidden
‘to taste, not bread and wine, but the *antitype* of the body
‘and blood of Christ.’ (15 15.) AMBROSE : ‘*The Shadow* in
‘the Law, *the image* in the Gospel, the truth or reality in
‘the heavenly places. The *shadow* of Christ was in the rock
‘which brought forth water, and followed the people. Was
‘not that in a *shadow* a *sacrament* of this all-holy mystery ?
‘Was not the water from the rock in a *shadow* ? Now we
‘see good things by an *image*, and we hold the good things
‘of the *image*. We have seen the High Priest offering for
‘us His blood. But now we see Him not ; then shall we see
‘Him when the *image* shall have passed away, the truth or
‘reality shall have come.’ (17 7, 8.) ‘Here is *the shadow* ;
‘here *the image* ; there the truth or reality. The *shadow*
‘in the Law, *the image* in the Gospel, truth or reality in the
‘heavenly places.’ (17 13.) ‘It was surely the true flesh of
‘Christ which was crucified, which was buried ; therefore,
‘this is truly the *sacrament* of His flesh. The Lord Jesus
‘Himself proclaims : “This is my body.”’ (17 15.) ‘But
‘haply thou sayest, “I see not the appearance of blood.”
‘But it hath a *likeness*. For as thou hast received a *like-*
‘*ness* of death [*i.e.*, in Baptism], so also thou drinkest a *like-*
‘*ness* of the precious blood.’ ‘Let this oblation be ascribed
‘valid, reasonable, acceptable, because it is a *figure* of the
‘body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.’ (17 16.)

51. JEROME : ‘The Lord offered not water, but wine, in the
‘*type* of His blood.’ (18 6.) ‘Of which the Lord’s bread is
‘made and the *type* of His blood fulfilled.’ (18 28.) ‘In
‘order that He Himself also *might represent* the reality of

'His body and blood in the same manner as Melchizedec had 'done when offering bread and wine in prefiguration of Him.' (18 56.) GAUDENTIUS: 'He plainly declares all wine which 'is offered *in the figure* of His passion is His blood.' (19 4.) 'For truly this (sacrifice instituted by Christ) is the hereditary 'gift of His New Testament, which He left us in that night 'when He was betrayed to be crucified, as a *pledge* of His 'presence.' (19 10. See Bertram 25 50-54.) 'He appointed 'the sacraments of His body and blood to be offered *in the* 'form of bread and wine.' (19 12.) 'Reasonably is this '[bread] taken as a *figure* of the body of Christ.' (19 13.) 'In like way too the wine is taken as a *figure* of His blood.' (19 14.) 'We bishops, deacons, and the faithful offer the 'effects of the passion of Christ for the well-being of our 'common life, *in the figure* of His body and blood.' (19 16.) RUFFINUS: 'The Lord prepared a table, when *in* His *sacra-* 'ment He gave to us His flesh to eat, and His blood to drink.' (20 9.)

52. AUGUSTINE: 'Concerning the sacrament which he hath 'well received, since it hath been well commended to him, 'that things visible are indeed *signs* of divine realities, but 'that *in the signs* the invisible realities themselves are 'honoured.' (21 26.) 'For the Lord did not hesitate to say, '"This is my body," when He gave a *sign* of His body.' (21 35.) These [Eucharist, &c.] are *tokens* of things which are 'fulfilled.' (21 38.) 'He commended and delivered to His 'disciples *the figure* of His own body and blood.' (21 44.) 'This Bread [which came down from heaven] the altar of God '*doth signify*. Those were sacraments; in *signs* they are 'diverse, in the thing signified they are alike.' (21 77.) 'Jesus Christ commended His body and blood *in those things*, '[that is, bread and wine, sacraments or sacred signs.] (21 83.) 'How is the bread His body? and the cup, or what the cup 'contains, how is it His blood? These things [bread and 'wine] are called *sacraments*, because *in them* one thing is 'seen, another understood.' (21 135.)

53. CHRYSOSTOM: 'For if Jesus did not die, of what are 'the consecrated elements the *symbols*? (22 7.) 'For neither 'would it be just, that through the wickedness of another

‘those who come in faith to the *symbols* of their salvation should be harmed.’ (22 15.) ‘The priest only fills up a *symbol*.’ (22 31.) THEODORET: ‘For He calls the Church His body, and through it, as man, He exercises the priest’s office; but as God, He receiveth the offerings. But the Church offereth the *symbols* of His body and blood.’ (23 14.) ‘For after His coming there will be no more need of the *symbols* of His body and blood, since His body itself will appear.’ (23 29.) ‘For in all holy Baptism, we see the *type* of the resurrection, but then we shall see the resurrection itself. Here we behold the *symbols* of the Lord’s body; there we shall see the Lord Himself.’ (23 30.) ‘He placed upon his mouth the *symbols* of the divine mysteries.’ (23 37.) ‘Whereof thinkest thou the all-holy food is a *symbol* and *type*? Of the Godhead of the Lord Christ, or of His body and blood? Plainly of those things whose names they have received. Do you mean of the body and blood? I do. For the Lord also, when He took the *symbol*, did not say, “This is my Divinity,” but “This is my body.”’ (23 41.) ‘The mystical *symbols* offered to God by the priests, whereof are they the *symbols*? Of the body and blood of the Lord. . . . The divine mysteries are *antitypes* of a true body. (23 43.) ‘How call you the other *symbols*? By a common name that signifies ‘a kind of drink [wine].’ (23 44.) ‘For the mystic *symbols* depart not from their own nature.’ (23 45.) ‘But if this [the body of our Jesus Christ] appear small and worthless, how dost thou suppose that its *type* would be holy and saving?’ (23 47.) ‘Showing the *type* of the passion, He did not therefore call to mind His Divinity.’ (23 49.) ‘He took the *symbol* and said, “This is my body which is given “for you.”’ (23 50.) ‘And when He delivered the divine mysteries, and had broken and distributed the *symbol*, He subjoined, “This is my body.”’ (23 51.) BEDE: ‘For the flesh or blood of the lamb substituting a *sacrament* of His flesh and blood *in the figure* of bread and wine.’ (24 4.)

54. This is a fair specimen of the way the Fathers speak of the elements after consecration. Now did these distinguished men in using such language intend it to be understood that symbols, figures, &c., actually and really contain

the presence of those things of which they are the symbols, figures, &c? Dr Pusey, as we have seen, maintains that this was the doctrine of the Fathers, and to prove that it was, he gives about a dozen extracts, some of which are doubtful, from more than a hundred folio volumes of patristic records. These extracts happen to have the little word 'in' so placed from the accidents or chances of position, that with other congenial words, and duly manipulated by artificial means, and the context also disregarded, Dr Pusey manages to get from them a few phrases which seem to teach his doctrine. No amount of manipulation, however, can give even the semblance of his doctrine to the above extracts, no, not in such phrases as the following, with the little word 'in' italicized—'Representation was *in* an image,' '*In* the type of His blood,' '*In* the signs,' '*In* sacraments,' '*In* the figure of His passion,' '*In* the form of bread and wine,' '*In* the figure of His body,' '*In* His sacrament.'

55. Dr Pusey tells us that 'the Calvinist party [in which party he includes all who are not Paschasians] inferred wrongly, that the Fathers who used these terms [symbols, images, &c.], thought with themselves that the outward or visible part was an emblem—not of the inward part or thing signified, but of an absent thing.' (35 32). Part of this statement is most fallacious, for even Zwingle and his followers maintain, as we have seen, that the outward or visible part of the sacrament was an emblem of the inward part, or thing signified (sec. 21), and so teaches our Catechism. Had Dr Pusey stated the case fairly and truthfully, the latter part of the statement would have been to the following effect—'The Calvinist party think that the outward or visible part was an emblem, not of the inward part or thing signified, *present in the emblems*, but of the inward part or thing signified, *not present in them*.' This we maintain is substantially what the Fathers teach. The Paschasian party, to which Dr Pusey belongs, think that the outward or visible part was an emblem of the inward part or thing signified *present in the emblems*, but not of an inward part or thing signified, *not present in them*. This we hold the Fathers did not teach. That the reader may not misunderstand the

question at issue, we ask, did the Fathers believe the consecrated bread and wine to be antitypes, figurative representations, symbols, memorials, figures, images, sacraments, likenesses, types, pledges, signs, or tokens of the body and blood of Christ, and as antitypes, figurative representations, symbols, memorials, figures, images, sacraments, likenesses, types, pledges, signs, or tokens to have *in them* the actual and real presence of Christ's body and blood? Or, did the Fathers believe the consecrated elements to be antitypes, &c., of the body and blood of Christ, but as antitypes, &c., not to have *in them* the actual and real presence of Christ's body and blood? We maintain that the latter, and not the former, was the belief of the Fathers. In some of the above extracts we have incontrovertible evidence that the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper were believed by the Fathers to be symbols, images, memorials, or pledges in the place of Christ's presence, implying His bodily absence.

56. Tertullian says, 'He consecrated wine to be a memorial 'of His blood.' Eusebius says, 'We ought to celebrate the 'memory of this sacrifice through the symbols, &c.' (See Bertram 25 64, 65). Ambrose in effect states—Here is the shadow, here the image, there (*viz.* in heaven) is the Reality. The shadow is in the Law, the image in the Gospel, the Reality in Heaven. Gaudentius, 'as a pledge of His presence.' Theodoret says, 'For after His coming there will be no more 'need of the symbols of His body and blood, since His body 'itself will appear.' Again, 'Here we behold the symbols of 'the Lord's body, there we shall see the Lord himself.' Dr Pusey admits, as we have seen, that the consecrated elements are figures, types, &c., such as are enumerated above. Consequently, when our Lord said, 'This is my body,' He must be understood to mean as well represented by Tertullian and Augustine, 'This bread is a figure of my body.' (10 12.) 'This bread is a sign of my body.' (21 35.) Dr Pusey admits this, and yet, as we have already shown, he and his school contend that our Lord's words must be taken literally (ch. ii. 5), yea, as literally as the phrase, 'The Word was 'made flesh.' (35 31.) Now, how does he solve this paradox? As follows, 'The proposition, "This bread is my body,"

'could have no other meaning than that it was in some way 'both. "This, which is in its natural substance bread, is "sacramentally my body, through the presence of my body "under its form."' (35 36.) It should be borne in mind that Dr Pusey not only admits that the consecrated elements are types, &c., but says 'nothing is more natural than that 'such titles should be given to the outward part' (sec. 47 above), meaning, of course, the consecrated bread and wine.

57. That the reader may have an exact representation of Dr Pusey's teaching on this point, it shall be stated in the form which he has given us. The form is, 'This, which is 'in its natural substance bread, is sacramentally my body 'through the presence of my body under its form.' (35 36.) But Dr Pusey teaches that, 'The sacrament of the Eucharist 'having two parts, an inward and an outward,' (35 32) (meaning, of course, the consecrated bread and wine) and that the outward really and actually contains the inward, viz., the body and blood. This part, then, must be added in order to give Dr Pusey's full teaching; with this necessary addition the form is as follows:—

'This, which is in its natural substance bread consecrated into a 'sacrament, is sacramentally my body, through the presence of my 'body under it.' 'This which is consecrated into a mystery is mystic-ally my body, through the presence of my body under it.' 'This, 'which is consecrated into a type, is typically or in type my body, 'through the presence of my body under it.' 'This, which is conse- 'crated into an antitype, is antitypically my body, through the presence 'of my body under it.' 'This, which is consecrated into a figure, is 'figuratively my body, through the presence of my body under it.' 'This, which is consecrated into a symbol, is symbolically my body, 'through the presence of my body under it.' 'This which is conse- 'crated into an image, is representatively my body, through the pre- 'sence of my body under it.' 'This, which is consecrated into a 'likeness, is in resemblance my body, through the presence of my 'body under it.' 'This, which is consecrated into a sign, is signifi- 'cantly my body, through the presence of my body under it.'

58. It may seem incredible that Dr Pusey should maintain that the Fathers when they use such nomenclature as 'in the 'type,' or 'typically,' &c., in relation to the consecrated elements, believed that the types, images, &c., of which they spoke really contained that of which they were the types, images, &c.

But he, as we have seen and fully considered, says, the Fathers express 'a real presence under that outward veil. S. Cyril of Jerusalem says, "*In the type of bread is given to thee His body, and in the type of wine His blood,*"' &c. (35 33.) The Fathers cannot by any possibility be made to teach Dr Pusey's doctrine except by some such misinterpretations as those given above. The misinterpretation, or rather perversion of what they teach, is corrected, by leaving out in the above statements the words, 'through the presence of my body.' When Dr Pusey says, 'The proposition, "This is my body," could have no other meaning than that it was in some way both. "This, which is in its natural substance bread, is sacramentally my body,"' (35 36) we perfectly agree with him, and thus far he is in accord with the Fathers. But when he believes the presence of Christ's body to be really in the bread, and that bread to be a type, figure, image, &c. of the body, the Fathers do not only not teach such a doctrine, but by anticipation have plainly contradicted it.

59. In different controversies which they had, not in any way connected with the subject of this present one, they had occasion to speak of the relation which a figure bore to that of which it was a figure, of an image to that of which it was an image, from which it will be seen that in their judgment images and figures could not be or contain that of which they were the figures and images, especially material insensible figures and images, for in regard to one living image they make an exception. Theodoret speaks as follows:—'For images not living have not the essence or substance of those things of which they are the images, but a living image, and having what is unchangeable, has the same nature as the archetype.' (23 32.) Paschasius, as we have seen, infers from an image of this kind that the material and insensible images or figures used by the Fathers in relation to the consecrated elements may admit of a similar interpretation. (33 5-7.) Herein he is followed by Dr Pusey. In addition to what Theodoret has said above of images not living, he further states, 'An image has figures, but not things or realities.' (23 22.) Again he says, 'A type has not all the things which the reality has.' 'All things have not whatever the archetype has,' &c. (23 42.) He yet

further states, 'For there must be an archetype of an image, 'for painters imitate nature and draw the images of visible 'things.' (23 43.) No one could maintain that images contain actually and really the presence of their archetype; according to the argument and illustration of Theodoret, no more do the symbols and images of the Lord's Supper. Let the reader note well the entire passage and Dr Pusey's omission of the portion most fatal to his own opinions. Tertullian expressly states, 'Now an image is not in any case equal to the reality. 'It is one thing to be like the reality, and another thing to 'be the reality itself.'—*Adver. Mar.* lib. ii., cap. ix. p. 372. Ambrose states, 'No one can ever have been an image of him- 'self.' (17 14.) Augustine, his pupil, also says, 'What can 'be more absurd than to be called an image with respect to 'one's self?'—*De Trin.* lib. vii., cap. i., tom. iii., p. 127. Still more to the point is Gaudentius—'But a figure is not 'the reality of the Lord's passion. For a figure is not the 'reality, but an imitation of the reality.' (19 3.) From this evidence the reader, without any further statements, may be left to form his own conclusions.

60. But Dr Pusey has also told us what the Roman Catholic party believe as well as the Calvinist, and his statement is more accurate concerning the former than the latter. He seems to be more at home and familiar with Rome than with Canterbury and Geneva. He says, 'Roman Catholic contro- 'versialists denied that there was any outward existing part, 'which was a symbol.' (35 32.) Such extracts as those which we have given above from the Fathers respecting symbols, figures, images, &c., and they are but a sample in comparison of what might be quoted from their entire testimony, must be terribly in the way of those who hold the Paschasian doctrine of the real presence. Be it observed that there is no difference between Dr Pusey's doctrine of the real presence and that of Roman Catholics. The difference chiefly consists in the way in which they go about to square the teaching of the Fathers with their doctrine. The Romanists, rather than hold Dr Pusey's interpretation of the symbolic words and phrases of the Fathers, which is substantially that of Paschasius, adopt a more modern fashion of treatment, and deny that there is

any outward existing part which is a symbol. This is but one instance out of many of the outrageous treatment to which the teaching of the Fathers must be submitted to bring them into accordance with the Paschasian doctrine of the real presence.

61. Before leaving this point we have an important and kindred one yet to consider. In immediate connection with the peculiar teaching of Dr Pusey in regard to the symbolic words and phrases of the Fathers which we have now examined, he states, 'The word *in*, like the word of our book 'of Homilies, "under the form of bread and wine," only re-
'presents a real presence under that outward veil.' (35 33.) Of all the phrases employed by the Ritualists, this one, 'in or
'under the form of bread and wine' is the most important in their estimation. It occurs on many a page, and often more than once on a page in the writings of Dr Pusey and his simple disciples, always bristling with inverted commas, the quantity of which so employed must have been sensibly felt by the type-founders. It deserves, then, more than a passing notice.

62. What makes the phrase of such peculiar value to the Ritualists is the fact, that for many centuries it has been commonly used and generally understood to express the doctrine of the real and actual presence of Christ's body and blood, and that it is included in an advertisement at the end of the First Book of Homilies, and has been retained in all subsequent editions. The phrase is as follows, 'Hereafter
'shall follow sermons of fasting, prayer, &c.; of the due
'receiving of His blessed body and blood under the form of
'bread and wine, &c.' This book was printed in 1547, at which time there is little doubt that the phrase was considered to be expressive of the doctrine of the real presence as now understood by Ritualists. Dean Goode maintained, with considerable probability, that the phrase was employed in the advertisement as teaching the doctrine of transubstantiation. Dr Pusey denies this, but holds that it is expressive of the doctrine of the real presence as held by the transubstantiationists. From the circumstance of the phrase being retained in all subsequent editions, the Ritualists zealously

maintain that it is now expressive of the present doctrine of the Church of England. Dr Pusey employs 154 pages to prove this, and concludes, apparently to his own satisfaction, that the Church of England holds exactly his doctrine of the real presence. After all this attempt at elaborate proof, Dr Heurtley charges with dishonest use of the notice of the homily those who cite it as attesting the belief of the real objective presence, and applies to this the saying, 'In fraudem legis facit qui, salvis verbis legis sententiam *'legis circumvenit.'*' (He doth wrong to the law, that, following only the bare words, *defraudeth* the meaning of the law.) Sermon by Dr Pusey, *Will ye also go away*, pref. p. vii.

63. We now undertake to prove that the phrase, considered in its early usage, does not express the doctrine Dr Pusey assigns to it, and that the writers of the Second Book of Homilies and the compilers of the Liturgy and Articles did not hold that doctrine. He states that 'the word *in*, like the word of our Book of Homilies "*under* the "form of bread and wine," only expresses a real presence 'under that outward veil.' (35 33.) The statement would have been much more accurate had it been given thus, 'the phrase *under* the form of bread and wine like the word '*in*, &c.' As an historical fact, the former style of expression is equivalent to the latter, and, as we shall see, is derived from it. The phrase in question often occurs in the Latin translations of the writings of the Greek Fathers as a rendering of the words 'in the type of.' (See Cyril of Jerusalem 15 12, and Theodoret 23 15.) Theodoret, in his Commentary on Zechariah, says, 'Zechariah sees sin in type of a 'woman,' which, in the Latin translation, is 'under the form 'of a woman' (*sub specie mulieris*). In these three instances, as well as in others which might be quoted, it is certain that the use of this Latin phrase does not necessarily imply either the doctrine of transubstantiation or a real presence. It is true Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the ointment, as if it were Christ's gift of grace (15 11); and, as we have seen, in a Latin translation of Theodoret, the words, 'Having received '*under that visible form* of ointment, the invisible grace of 'the all Holy Spirit.' No one pretends that the ointment or

chrism was Christ's gift of grace, or that that gift of the Holy Ghost was actually and really under the form of ointment or chrism. Dr Pusey himself tells us that 'Cyril calls 'the chrism by the name of the grace which it conveys.' (35 37—see ch. viii. 67.)

64. This admits of confirmation from the writings of Bellarmine. In the index to the third volume of his writings under the phrase 'sacramental forms,' it is asked 'Whether the forms of bread and wine can be called a typical 'body,' and the answer at col. 489 is, 'That the symbols of 'bread and wine are rightly called a typical and symbolical 'body; for all Catholics say that the Eucharist is a sacrament, 'sign, or symbol of a sacred thing, that is, of the body of 'Christ. But the question between us and Sacramentarians 'is, Whether these symbols are symbols of an absent or a 'present thing; for we say that *under the symbols* are truly 'contained the Lord's body which they deny. And moreover 'the true body itself, as it is in the Eucharist, is a type and 'symbol of His very self as He was on the cross, and as He 'is now in heaven.' (*De Sac.*, lib. ii. cap. viii.)

65. Obviously with Bellarmine the phrase 'under the symbols' is exactly equivalent to the phrase 'under the forms.' We cannot but notice in passing the outrageous shifts Romanists and Ritualists employ to give to their doctrine the semblance of agreement with the Fathers, and yet retain the notion of the real presence in the elements. In the above passage Bellarmine gives an ordinary specimen of the extraordinary shifts to which Romanists have recourse in defence of their peculiar opinions. Peter Martyr and others had alleged a passage out of Origen against the Roman doctrine, in which passage Origen beyond all question affirmed the consecrated elements to be a 'typical and symbolical body.' (11 5.) To this Bellarmine makes answer, 'that symbols of 'bread and wine are rightly called a typical and symbolical 'body, for all Catholics say that the Eucharist is a sacrament, 'sign, or symbol of a sacred thing, that is, of the body of 'Christ.' Very good so far, if Roman Catholics do say so and really believe what they say. But what about the real presence *in* the symbols. So far, however, we have no typical and sym-

bolical body such as Origen represented: this must yet be made out, and it is done in this wise. The real, substantial, actual body of Christ is converted into a type and symbol of the body which Christ had on the cross, and which He has now in heaven. Origen, had he the opportunity, would marvel greatly at his interpreters if he did not frown upon them as his perverters, and so will the candid reader, if he duly considers Origen's own statement (11 5), and the above perversion thereof.

66. Lanfranc, one of the first recognized defenders of the heresy of Paschasius, set Bellarmine the example of thus perverting the plain statements of the Fathers. Berenger had cited these words from Augustine, 'As the sacrament of the body of Christ after a certain manner is the body of Christ, &c.' (See ch. viii. 72, 73.) Here, beyond all question, the sacrament cannot contain the actual and real presence of the body which it signifies. Lanfranc plainly admits this, yet he says, 'The sacrament is Christ's flesh which we receive in the sacrament concealed in the form of bread, and we drink His blood under the form and flavour of wine; the flesh, that is to say, the sacrament of flesh, the blood the sacrament of blood, and in the flesh and blood each invisible, intelligible, spiritual, is signified the visible, manifestly palpable body of the Redeemer.' How, then, does he meet the requirements of Augustine's statement? He as it were introduces another sacrament not supposed to contain the presence of that of which it is a sacrament, and the symbols of this sacrament are the real body and blood of Christ, and by these are signified the visible and manifestly palpable body of the Redeemer. If Lanfranc the master could thus treat the plain language of Augustine, we need not wonder at Bellarmine, the disciple, dealing out the same measure to Origen.

67. To come back to our point, the analogy and equality of these phrases, viz., 'in or under the forms, in or under the symbols, signs, &c.' will now be shown from the early Fathers, and at the same time the folly of the belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation in assuming that by the phrase 'under the *forms* of bread and wine' is meant under the shams or shows of bread and wine, those things which were

bread and wine being believed to be so no longer, and to have only the appearance of what they were.

68. Gaudentius states—Christ appointed the sacrament of His body and blood to be offered *in the form* of bread and wine, and the bread, the making of which he describes, ‘reasonably is taken as a figure of the body of Christ.’ (19 12.) Here the sacramental bread and wine are no mere appearances, but really and actually bread and wine; and it is evident that with Gaudentius the phrase ‘in or under the ‘form’ is equivalent to the phrase ‘in or under the figure.’ See also 19 4 for a parallel passage. Dr Pusey’s translation may be disregarded as being unaccountable.

69. Augustine in his *Treatise on the Trinity*, having occasion to speak of a variety of things used for the purpose of signification, classes under the word *form* three things employed as signs in Holy Scripture, the brazen serpent, letters, and consecrated bread in the Eucharist. (21 19.) It is needless to remark that these signs were substances, and that they did not contain in them those things of which they were the signs, and though according to the usage of the Fathers it might be said ‘under the form of a serpent,’ ‘under the ‘form of letters,’ and ‘under the form of bread,’ yet we should make an egregious mistake if from the use of such phraseology we necessarily inferred that the things which these signs represented were actually in them. Elsewhere he says that the manna of the wilderness signified Christ the bread of life, and that the altar (meaning of course what was placed upon it) signified the same Blessed Person. He calls these substantial and real things, sacraments, different in signs, but the same as to their signification. Then he proceeds to speak of other sacramental elements, and on the words, ‘and ‘did all drink the same spiritual drink,’ he remarks, ‘They ‘one thing, we another, but other only in the visible *form*, ‘which however should signify this same thing in its spiritual ‘virtue.’ (21 77.) Here Augustine might have spoken of the sacramental elements, manna and bread, as he spoke of the sacramental elements, water and wine, and *vice versa*, without altering the sense. Thus in relation to the manna and bread, he might have said, in or under the form of

manna or bread ; in or under the sign of water or wine. Here, too, it is certain that the visible form denoted water to the Jews and wine to the Christians. It is needless to say that these were not shams because the word form was applied to them as Romanists pretend, but were real substantial water and wine. Elsewhere Augustine plainly employs the word form in the place of the word sign. (21 26.) See also 21 18, 94, 137, where it is certain Augustine could not have used the word *form* in the sense of sham or mere appearance.

70. We may come to the certain conclusion that the phrase 'in or under the form' is a more general way of expressing a number of equivalent phrases. Thus, all the various symbolical terms contained in the citations from the Fathers, as given above (secs. 49-53, 57) might be substituted by the word *form*, without affecting the sense, as follows:—The body or blood in or under the form (the antitype) in or under the form (the figurative representation) in or under the form (the symbol, figure, image, sacrament, likeness, type, pledge, sign, or token.) It has been demonstrated that the Fathers by using such phrases as 'in the likeness,' 'in the type,' 'in the 'image,' &c., did not teach that the body and blood of Christ were actually and really in the consecrated elements. It has been proved that the phrase 'in or under the form' is exactly equivalent to such phrases as those just given, consequently it is demonstrated that the phrase in question was not intended to teach the real and actual presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated bread and wine.

71. We shall now proceed to show that the writers of the Second Book of Homilies, the compilers of the Liturgy, and the framers of the articles did not teach the doctrine which Dr Pusey affixes to the phrase 'under the form,' &c. The fact is, the phrase, like the words, 'This is my body,' has been employed as expressive of the doctrine of the real presence as defined by transubstantiation, and of the same kind of presence though not so defined. Dr Pusey considers both phrases as expressive of the latter kind of presence, and explains each in juxtaposition to that effect. (35 36.) It is notorious that Crammer and his colleagues employed the phrase in both these

ways, but it is in the latter way that Dr Pusey considers the phrase to be employed in the advertisement in the Homilies, and contends that in that sense it is now expressive of the doctrine of the Church of England. It is very common for Ritualists and High Anglicans to cite from the writings of our English Reformers before they attained that character, or only partially. In regard to the doctrine of the real presence, Cranmer can be cited as a real Romanist, as a Lutheran, and as an able and most successful maintainer and defender of those views which Romanists and High Anglicans are so fond of stigmatizing as Zwinglian. It is a disputed point between Dr Pusey and Dean Goode whether Cranmer, at the time the sentence in question was published, was a believer in the doctrine of transubstantiation, or the same real presence without that definition of it. The Dean maintained the former; Dr Pusey maintains the latter. Both, however, quote with approval the following statement of Cranmer, ‘But this I confess of myself, that not long before I wrote the said catechism I was in that error of the real presence, as I was many years past in divers other errors, as of transubstantiation,’ &c.—*Works*, vol. i., p. 374.

72. Here plainly Cranmer confesses to have entertained three different opinions in relation to the doctrine in question. This statement was made in the year 1551. At this time he was not in the error of the real presence, but was in that error not long before he wrote his catechism, which was published in 1548. He confesses to have been in the error of transubstantiation many years past, as he certainly was when in 1538 he examined John Lambert before King Henry VIII. respecting that doctrine, and Lambert refusing to acknowledge it, was burnt alive according to the Roman Catholic orthodox fashion. The first Book of Homilies in which the advertisement in question appeared was published in 1547. We ask, was Cranmer *then* in the error of the real presence? It is extremely probable that he was, but within one year of this we have proof that he relinquished that error. Traheron, writing to Bullinger, Sept. 28, 1548, says—‘That you may add yet more to the praises of God, you must know that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the

'Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury and 'the other bishops, who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans.'—*Letters P. S.*, vol. i., p. 322. Cranmer himself on or before the year 1551 confesses the same thing. Dr Pusey speaking of this says, 'Cranmer, when he had gone over to the Swiss 'School, says that he was *then* "in the error of the real presence." The question is, could Cranmer after this be a party to retaining that error in the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England? We have every proof to the contrary from the documents themselves, and the thing is incredible. In the exhortation in the Communion Service of 1552 we read, 'Our Heavenly Father . . . hath given His 'Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but 'also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, *as it is declared 'unto us as well by God's word as by the holy sacraments of 'His blessed body and blood.*' Cranmer has recorded the same sentiments in his writings (31 4.)

73. It can scarcely be pretended that the Second Book of Homilies, supposed to have been written chiefly by Bishop Jewel, and revised and published in 1563, gives currency to what Cranmer properly called the error of the real presence. How opposed Jewel himself was to this error may be seen in our extracts from his writings. (32 1-11.)

74. But Dr Pusey adduces no less an important witness than Bertram, who freely uses the word '*form*,' of which Dr Pusey gives undoubted instances, and then remarks, 'This 'language of Bertram bears the more upon this question, 'because his book was in familiar use both by Ridley and 'Cranmer. . . . Ridley himself translated it, and published 'it in English in the year 1548. It was the great instrument 'in swaying the belief of Cranmer. I doubt not that Bertram 'really believed the very doctrine impugned, the inward presence of the body and blood of Christ, under the outward 'part of the sacrament, or "the form of bread and wine."' (*The Real Presence*, &c., p. 9.)

75. Here it must be admitted that Dr Pusey gives strong presumptive evidence that Ridley and Cranmer believed what Bertram believed touching the real presence. But supposing Bertram did not believe the inward presence of the body and

blood of Christ under the outward part of the sacrament, or 'under the form of bread and wine,' then Bertram is a witness against, and not for, him. That he did not, we are quite certain. Dr Pusey has cited several passages from Bertram, in which he uses the word *form* as descriptive of what is outward and material in the Lord's Supper, but not one of these passages cited gives the remotest hint that in, or under, the forms there were really the body and blood of Christ, as Dr Pusey believes, and the context of the citations gives proof to the contrary.

76. If the reader will turn to 25 8, he will find the first of Dr Pusey's extracts from Bertram, distinguished by brackets, and he may notice how in the immediate context Bertram states 'that the bread and wine are *in a figure* the body and 'blood of Christ.' What Bertram says of the bread will be seen in the section immediately preceding. He maintains that the form or nature of bread is the same after as it was before consecration, 'but inwardly a far different thing *is signified*' (25 7), not *really contained* in or under the form or nature of bread.

77. In 25 9 will be found another of Dr Pusey's citations distinguished as before. In the context it will be there seen that Bertram blames Paschasians for taking the words of institution literally and not figuratively. He understood them figuratively, and ably and conclusively proved that they could not be rightly understood literally. Paschasius and his disciples, whether Romanists or Ritualists, but including Dr Pusey, might use the phrase, 'The body and blood of Christ 'under the form of bread and wine,' and so might Bertram, if he did not really do so. But each party attaches an essentially different meaning to the phrase; the one understands it in this sense, 'The body and blood of Christ really, literally, 'and not figuratively, under the form of bread and wine.' The other in this sense, 'The body and blood of Christ not 'really and literally, but figuratively under the form of bread 'and wine.' This latter is the view of Bertram, and is ably maintained in his valuable treatise '*On the Body and Blood of the Lord*,' as we have already shown, and that Bertram well represents all antiquity, may be seen from the other parts of our *Cutena Patrum*.

78. For the third extract, the reader is referred to **25 10**. The whole of that section is cited by Dr Pusey, but the part he has quoted in reference to the word *form* is given in italics. In the context, Bertram, speaking of a change for the better in regard to the elements after consecration, says, 'and since 'this change is not corporally, but spiritually wrought, it must 'needs be said to be wrought figuratively.' Dr Pusey's translation is, 'it must needs be *said* figuratively.' But for very good reasons we are compelled here and elsewhere to follow another translation. Such language as 'to be done' or 'wrought figuratively,' in regard to the effects of consecration is utterly subversive of the notion that by that act the bread and wine become really and actually the body and blood of Christ.

79. What immediately follows (**25 10**) is calculated to perplex the reader not familiar with patristic phraseology, especially at a time when it is so egregiously misapplied by Romanists and Ritualists. What Bertram there really teaches, expressed in a less recondite manner, is, that the elements after consecration are really still bread and wine, but in signification represent the body and blood of Christ. But does not Bertram say that the bread and the wine are mysteries of them? True; but he does not teach that the mysteries or sacraments are the body and blood, or, that they really contain them. This point will come under consideration in noticing the last citation made by Dr Pusey. (**25 32**.) Here Bertram interprets Ambrose as showing that consecrated bread is not, neither does it contain the real flesh of Christ, except in a sacrament, that is, sacramentally. Here it should be borne in mind that he employs the word sacrament and mystery in the sense of a sacred sign as defined by Augustine, and not as defined in our Catechism. This is his meaning of the word sacrament, as explained by its immediate context. He says bread in a sacrament, or sacramentally, is the true body of Christ; but a little above he states, the flesh, viz., that which we call flesh, in a mystery containeth the similitude of the real and natural flesh of Christ, and is not flesh in its nature or reality, but in a sacrament, or sacramentally. (**25 32**.) In the section immediately preceding Bertram points

out how carefully Ambrose makes the distinction between the real flesh of Christ, and the sacrament of it, and remarks 'that the mystery, which is now performed in the church, is 'the sacrament of that true flesh,' namely, a sacred sign or similitude of it. (25 31.)

80. Sir Robert Phillimore, in what we may call his vindication of the Rev. W. J. F. Bennett's doctrine of the real presence, has reproduced the substance of this very argument employed by Dr Pusey, namely, that as Bertram adopted pretty much the same form of expression as the phrase, 'under 'the form of bread and wine,' its meaning may be determined by his teaching. Thus, after having cited the advertisement of the first book of Homilies, he says, 'And it is not unimportant to observe that, early in the reign of Elizabeth, 'the bishops advert to this statement; for in their title to the 'Second Book of the Homilies, they speak 'of such matters 'as were promised *and entituled* in the former Book of 'Homilies.' And in Queen Elizabeth's 'Primer of 1559 'we find the prayer, "Our Saviour and Redeemer Jesus "Christ, which in thy last supper with thine apostles, didst "deliver thy blessed body and blood under the form of bread "and wine." The first book of Homilies has undergone two 'revisions, and the statement, "under the form of bread and "wine," remains unchanged up to the present time. Rattramn (Bertram), it will be seen, adopted pretty much the 'same form of expression: At quia confitentur et corpus et 'sanguinem Christi esse, nec hoc esse potuisse, nisi facta in 'melius commutatione: neque, ista commutatio corporaliter, 'sed spiritualiter facta sit necesse est, ut jam figurate facta 'esse dicatur quoniam *sub velamento corporei panis corpor-eique vini spirituale corpus Christi spiritualisque sanguis 'existit.*'—(*Judgment, &c.*, pp. 71, 72.)

81. Two different translations of this will be found 25 10, and it has just been noticed in the sections immediately preceding. The Dean of Arches has followed the evil example of Dr Pusey in assuming that Mr Bennett's doctrine of the 'Real Presence is like that of Bertram's; whereas it is like that of Paschasius, whom Bertram answers.

82. Let the impartial and intelligent reader examine the

full extracts which we have given from Bertram (25 1-65), and our remarks upon them (ch. viii. 1-44), and he will be morally certain that if Ridley and Cranmer followed Bertram in his doctrine on the body and blood of the Lord, as Dr Pusey intimates, then those men could neither teach nor maintain the doctrine of the real presence as held by Dr Pusey and his slavish disciple, Mr Bennett; and if those martyrs thus followed the doctrine of Bertram, is it credible that they would embody a doctrine which they had deliberately relinquished, in any Christian formularies, whether of doctrine or worship, which they might compose and publish? Certainly not.

83. Both Dean Goode and Dr Pusey consider that the phrase, 'under the form,' &c., as it appeared in an advertisement of the first book of Homilies, published in 1547, was then employed as expressive of views of the real presence not held by Cranmer and other English Reformers in the year 1551. The former considers the phrase to have been at that time employed as expressive of the doctrine of transubstantiation, the latter as expressive of the same kind of real presence, but not thus defined. It is of no consequence to our argument which of these opinions is correct. It is admitted that, like 'This is my body,' the phrase in question has been employed to express both views, but it has been shown that it does not necessarily express either, and like the phrase 'This is my body,' it is consonant with the universal doctrine of the early Church, and of the English and the Continental Reformers, with the exception of Luther, and the Lutherans. Calvin commonly uses a parallel form of expression, thus, 'The body and blood of the Lord . . . *under the sacred symbols* of the Supper.' (30 15.) Again, 'He bids me, *under symbols of* bread and wine, to take His body and blood.' (30 16.)

84. Dean Goode attributes the retention of the phrase to the printers; Dr Pusey to the editors, and probably the latter is correct. The retention of the advertisement at the end of the First Book of Homilies, after the Second was published, must have been the deliberate act of the editors; for the title of the Second Book is as follows: 'The Second Part of

‘Homilies, of such matters as were promised and entituled in ‘the former part of Homilies.’ Now, what were the matters which were thus promised and entituled? They were ‘Sermons of Fasting, Prayer, Alms-deeds, of the Nativity, ‘Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Saviour, Christ, ‘of the due receiving of His blessed *body and blood under ‘the form of bread and wine, &c.*’ From the title of the Second Part of Homilies we should expect the same matters and the same titles; and so we have substantially, and even the same order, as may be seen from the following table, as given in the second book of Homilies, ‘Of Fasting, of Prayer, ‘of Alms-deeds, of the Nativity, of the Passion, of the Resurrection, of the *worthy receiving of the Sacrament, &c.*

85. No subsequent editor or editors could with propriety delete the advertisement appended to the first part of the Homilies, it being so distinctly recognised, and acted upon in the second part. It has been shown that the phrase in question does not necessarily teach the doctrine of any such presence as that which Dr Pusey ascribes to it, and that therefore its retention is no sufficient ground for him to lay his hands upon it and parade it as now teaching his doctrine to be that of the Church of England.

86. It should be specially noticed, that although the matters and titles of the second part of the Homilies are the counterpart of those in the advertisement appended to the first, yet in one notorious particular there is a marked difference. In the one we have ‘of the due receiving of His blessed body ‘and blood, under the form of bread and wine.’ In the other, ‘of the worthy receiving of the sacrament;’ but as an actual heading to the homily itself, it is given thus, ‘of the ‘worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the sacrament of ‘the body and blood of Christ.’ It is worthy of notice that Sir R. Phillimore has omitted all notice of this most important distinction.

87. Is it conceivable that if the author or authors of the second part of the Homilies had understood the words ‘under ‘the form,’ &c. as absolutely teaching the doctrine Dr Pusey ascribes to them, and still believed the same doctrine, that they would have thus changed the title, and under it publish

a homily from which not a vestige of evidence could be adduced in proof of the said doctrine? Dr Pusey has conceived it, and avowed his belief of it too. No other persons could, unless they possessed his powers of conception with his great credulity, of which many astounding specimens are recorded in these pages.

88. Thus far we have shown from the teaching of the Fathers, that although the body and blood of Christ may be said to be present in a sacrament, sacramentally; in a mystery, mystically; in an antitype, antitypically; in figurative representations, representatively; in symbol, symbolically; in figure, figuratively; in a type, typically; in image, in likeness, by representation; in sign, by signification, (see Jewel, 32 8), yet they are not actually and really present in the consecrated elements by whatever name the Fathers called them. The Reformers commonly speak of the consecrated elements, as being a sacramental or symbolical body of Christ as Origen did. (11 5.) Thus Zwingli, 'sacramental body' (29 9, 10), 'symbolical body of Christ.' (29 16.) 'The sacrament is not 'only entitled the body.' (29 11.) 'Bread is the body of 'Christ. . . . which more recent authors call sacramentally.' (29 20.)

89. Dr Pusey very unaccountably speaks of the elements as if they consisted of two parts which he designates outward and inward. He says the outward elements are a figure of the inward substance. An unaccountable faith requires an unaccountable defence. That the elements are figures of other things there can be no question. But of what are they the figures? The answer given by Dr Pusey to this question is not true, or if true, is only a portion of the truth. Thus he says, 'The question as to the elements themselves is not 'whether they are a figure of His body broken, and of His 'blood shed for us. The very action of the Holy Eucharist 'shows that they are.' (35 31.) Again he says, 'True, what 'we see, in that it is broken, is an image of his body which 'was slain; and in that it is poured out, is an image of His 'blood which was shed.' (35 17.) Here Dr Pusey regards the symbolical action in reference to the elements, such as the breaking of the bread and the pouring of the wine as the thing

figured by the elements. This is a mistake. It is very doubtful whether the action itself which Dr Pusey takes for granted, and almost all at the present day believe, admits of any defence from Holy Scripture or the teaching of the early Church. The Apostle Paul employs the word broken in narrating the institution of the Lord's Supper, according to the account given in our version, 'This is my body which is *'broken* for you.' (1 Cor. xi. 24.) But nothing equivalent to this word occurs either in the Vatican Greek text, as given by Cardinal Mai, the Codex Sinaiticus, or in the Greek text, as given by Tischendorf and Alford, but an equivalent is found in the two Syriac versions, the very ancient Peshito one and the Philoxenian.

90. Bishop Wordsworth gives reasons why the word should be retained, and accounts for its omission. It is in common use with the Greek Fathers, but is interpreted by them not in the strict sense of broken, but as broken in the sense of being imparted, and is considered by them as substantially the same in meaning as the word, 'is given,' as employed by St Luke (xxii. 19.) In this sense, it must have been understood by the Latin fathers, for both in the Latin vulgate, and the common ancient Latin version which preceded it, we have 'shall be delivered' (*tradetur*). In this sense, the word could not be considered as symbolical of Christ's body being broken. In fact, it is nowhere said in Scripture that His body was broken; but, on the contrary, we are told, 'A bone of Him shall not be broken.' (John xix. 36.) The word 'broken' is frequently used in Scripture in the sense of imparted. Thus in Isaiah we read, 'Deal (*break, Hebrew and Greek*) thy bread 'to the hungry.' (lviii. 7.) In Jeremiah, in the margin, and in the Greek, 'Break bread for them,' (xvi. 7.) 'The young children ask bread, and no man breaketh it unto them.' (Lamen. iv. 4.) The word is so used in the New Testament, as in St Mark, 'When I brake the five loaves among five thousand.' (viii. 19.) And much to the same effect elsewhere. (Acts ii. 42; xx. 7 11; and xxvii. 35.) Chrysostom in his commentary on the words, 'This is my body which is broken for you,' (1 Cor. xi. 24) remarks, 'He gave His body equally, but thou dost not give so much as the common

'bread equally. Yea, it was indeed broken for all alike, and 'became the body equally for all.' (22 22.) Again, on the words 'which we break' (1 Cor. x. 16) he says, 'For although 'in the Eucharist one may see this done, yet on the cross not 'so, but the very contrary. For, "A bone of Him," saith one, "shall not be broken." But that which He permitted not 'on the cross, this He permits in the oblation for thy sake, 'and submits to be broken, that He may fill all men.' (22 20.) On the former text Theophylact says, 'The body which 'He broke equally for all, being given up to death.' Œcumenius expresses the like view. On the latter text, Theophylact says, 'That which the Lord did not permit on the cross '(for a bone of Him was not broken) He now permits since He 'is broken for our sakes.' Herein also He is followed by Œcumenius. There is little or no evidence in favour of any symbolical action representing the breaking of Christ's body, and there is positively none representing the shedding of His blood.

91. Dr Pusey then goes on to say, 'The question so far is 'whether the elements are figures of what is present, although 'unseen, or of what is absent.' (35 31.) But of what things are the elements the figures? The answer Dr Pusey has given to this question is incorrect and most certainly incomplete. The plain answer of the Fathers is (and it is to their testimony we are now more especially appealing), the elements of water and flour combined in bread, and in the sacrament called bread, are figures of Christ's body, and the body of His believing people as one compound whole: and the elements of wine and water mingled, are figures of Christ's blood, and His people as one and undivided. This is fully noticed in ch. xi. 85-103, to which the reader is referred. Dr Pusey, although professing most devoutly to follow the teaching of the Fathers, does not believe that these things of which the elements are the figures, are really and actually in, or with, them. He believes that the body and blood of Christ are actually and really present in, or with them, but how they could be present separate from Christ's own body of redeemed and believing people with which, according to the teaching of the Fathers, they are indissolubly united, neither Dr Pusey nor any other mortal can tell.

CHAPTER XI.

THE SACRAMENTAL PHRASES OF CHRIST NOT TO BE TAKEN LITERALLY AFTER THE MANNER OF THOSE TEXTS WHICH ASSERT HIS HUMAN NATURE AS DR PUSEY CONTENDS. CONTRARY TO THE THEORY OF DR PUSEY, THE FATHERS TEACH THAT THE SACRAMENTAL SIGNS OF THE EUCHARIST WERE NO MORE THE REALITIES OF WHICH THEY WERE THE SIGNS THAN WERE ANY OF THE SACRAMENTAL SIGNS OF THE JEWISH CHURCH. THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS ILLUSTRATED IN REGARD TO CHRIST'S BEING PRESENT WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT SAINTS THROUGH THE MEDIUM OF THE WORD OF GOD. THEIR COMMON USE OF THE PHRASE, 'THE WORD OF GOD,' AS BEING ALIKE A TITLE OF CHRIST AND OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, AND THEIR BELIEF OF CHRIST'S SPIRITUAL PRESENCE IN HIS WORD AS MUCH AS IN HIS SACRAMENTS. PROOFS GIVEN THAT THE FATHERS RECEIVED THE WORD OF GOD WITH AS MUCH REVERENCE AS THEY DID THE SACRAMENTAL BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST. THE FATHERS SHOWN TO TEACH THAT THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST CAN BE RECEIVED APART FROM THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST AS WELL AS IN IT. THE METAPHORICAL USE OF THE WORDS BREAD, AND CUP OR WINE, AS USED BY THE FATHERS IN RELATION TO CHRIST AS OUR FOOD, SHOWN TO BE AS CAPABLE OF BEING RECEIVED APART FROM THE SACRAMENT AS IN IT. THE WORD BREAD UNDERSTOOD BY THE FATHERS TO BE PROPHETICALLY APPLIED TO CHRIST AS A TITLE. THEY SPEAK ALIKE OF CHRIST CALLING HIS BODY BREAD AS THEY DO OF HIS CALLING BREAD HIS BODY. THE PHRASE, DAILY BREAD, AS SPIRITUALLY INTERPRETED BY THE FATHERS IN RELATION TO CHRIST PERSONALLY, SHOWN, ACCORDING TO THEIR TEACHING, NOT TO BE THE SACRAMENTAL BREAD, BUT RATHER THE REALITY OF WHICH THAT BREAD IS THE SIGN AND AS CAPABLE OF BEING RECEIVED WITH THE WORD OF CHRIST AS WITH HIS SACRAMENT. AUGUSTINE, ESPECIALLY, IS SHOWN TO TEACH THAT THE SACRAMENTAL SIGNS OF THE EUCHARIST ARE NO MORE THE FLESH AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, OR CONTAIN THEM, THAN THE SIGNS, WHETHER WRITTEN OR SPOKEN, WHICH CONVEY TO US THE WORD OF GOD, ARE, OR CONTAIN HIS BODY AND BLOOD. PROOFS GIVEN THAT THE FATHERS, AND ESPECIALLY AUGUSTINE, SPEAK MORE EXPLICITLY OF THE PRESENCE OF THE BODY OF TRUE BELIEVERS IN THE EUCHARIST THAN THEY DO OF CHRIST, AND THAT THEY TEACH THAT CHRIST CANNOT BE PRESENT IN THE SACRAMENT WITHOUT HIS PEOPLE, AND HIS PEOPLE CANNOT BE PRESENT THEREIN WITHOUT HIM. EVIDENCE GIVEN THAT THE FATHERS COMMONLY ASSOCIATE THE WORDS BODY AND BLOOD IN RELATION TO CHRIST WITH UNDOUBTED METAPHORICAL WORDS WHICH NO ONE PRETENDS CAN BE UNDERSTOOD LITERALLY. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE FATHERS REPRESENT THE EATING OF THE CHRISTIAN PASSOVER SHOWN TO BE FATAL TO THE IDEA OF A LITERAL PARTICIPATION OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD IN THAT ORDINANCE.

1. The reader will have to bear continually in mind that the evidence to be obtained from the Christian authors of the first eight centuries, against the Paschasian doctrine of the ninth century, can only be indirect—that they could not definitely express opinions respecting things of which they had no knowledge, and it is universally admitted that the present controversy was unknown until the ninth century. This chapter then will be occupied with evidence of a more general character, especially in showing that the evidence adduced by Dr Pusey in favour of the real presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, as much proves, on the same principles of interpretation, that there was the same presence in the sacraments of the Israelites and in the inspired Word of God; and that after the same manner in which the body of Christ is present in the Eucharist, so also is present the body of His believing people.

2. Dr Pusey, with the Paschasians generally, labours very hard to make it appear that the sacramental signs of the Lord's Supper are in their nature and character essentially different from any thing of the kind in the Jewish dispensation. Thus he says,

‘But in those words of our Lord, “This is my body,” the question is, whether our Lord meant to express a spiritual reality, or whether, while He appeared to be speaking of a gift which He was bestowing, He meant that He gave to His apostles and to us only a shadow, a rite as outward as any of the law. . . . He did not give us fresh shadows, instead of realities. Our whole faith might be turned into a figure if men might assume as they pleased, that this or that, which they did not like to take literally, was a figure. The Docetæ might equally interpret, “The Word was made flesh,” as a figure, and contend that S. John's words did not establish that the Lord had real flesh. Nor has one who interprets as a figure “This is my body,” any answer to make to them.’ (35 31.)

This is a very dangerous piece of argumentation for one to use who believes in the Supreme Divinity of our blessed Saviour. According to this argument ‘The Word’ from the language used was no more really flesh, than the bread in the Eucharist was the body of Christ, that in fact the latter phrase must be taken as literally as the former. No orthodox father ever said of the phrase ‘The Word was made flesh,’ ‘that is a figure of the flesh.’ But Tertullian has said of the

phrase, 'This is my body,' 'that is a figure of my body.' (10 12.) Dr Pusey has cited this part of Tertullian, and it is supposed with approval. No orthodox father ever affirmed 'that St John did not hesitate to say, "The Word was made " flesh," when he meant a sign of His flesh.' But Augustine has said, 'The Lord did not hesitate to say, "This is my " body," when He gave a sign of His body,' (21 35.) Dr Pusey has also cited this but in a very isolated fashion. His argument is very much on the Marcionite side, and it would seem as if he were defending the heresy of Paschasius by that of Marcion.

3. Now Dr Pusey would have avoided misleading his readers had he said, 'But in these words of our Lord, " This is my body," the question is, whether our Lord meant 'to use sacramental phraseology common with those to whom 'it was addressed; and if so, how is it to be interpreted?' This is really the question as viewed from a patristic point of view, and from that source we shall now proceed to answer it. With the Fathers, as will be seen presently, sacraments or sacred signs, in their nature and design, were the same both in the Jewish and Christian dispensations, and were no more really that which they signified in the one than in the other. We might have supposed, judging from analogy, that there would have been some considerable difference between them, and this supposition would make Dr Pusey's argument very plausible. Ambrose conceived that there was some difference between them, and so far, by anticipation, agreed with Dr Pusey, that in the Law we had shadows; but, unlike him, he did not replace the shadows or sacramental signs by the realities, but by an image, the reality of which is yet future. Thus he says, 'Of those things which are 'now celebrated in the Church the shadow . . . was in 'the rock which brought forth water and followed the people. 'Was not that in a shadow a sacrament of this all-holy 'mystery? . . . Now we see good things by an image, and 'we hold the good things of the image . . . Now we see 'Him not; then shall we see Him, when image shall have 'passed away, the truth or reality shall have come. Then, 'at length, not in a glass, but face to face, shall be seen that

'which is perfect. Ascend, therefore, O man, into heaven, 'and you shall see those things of which here there was the 'shadow or the image.' (17 7, 8.) Dr Pusey found it convenient, as may be seen, to omit the latter part of the citation from which we learn that, in the opinion of Ambrose, the image was no more the reality than the shadow was. Elsewhere he says: 'Here is the shadow, here the image, there 'the truth or reality. The shadow in the law, the image in 'the gospel, truth or reality in the heavenly places.' (17 13.) Plainly, from this teaching of Ambrose, we can discover what is most true, viz., that the sacraments or sacred signs of the gospel present more distinctly to the mind that of which they are the sacraments than did those of the law; but in neither case do they contain the things signified or the realities.

4. Dr Pusey assumes that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is less outward, or, speaking from a patristic point of view, less sacramental, than were the sacraments of the law, such as the Passover, the manna, and the rock. Thus he says; 'Our Lord, in that solemn hour, was accomplishing 'the shadows of the law. Why should we think that He 'brought in a mere shadow, less expressive than those which 'He had abolished?' (35 14.) 'Christ did not give us fresh 'shadows instead of realities.' (35 31.) Those who do not accept Dr Pusey's doctrine of the real presence do not regard the sacrament in the sense he here seems to imply. The misrepresenters of Zwingle could not well imply more. It must be confessed that there is something plausible in his argument; nor is the inference unnatural; but it has been anticipated by some of the Fathers and answered, whereby we learn that the sacraments of the gospel no more really contain that of which they are the sacraments than did those of the law.

5. Thus Augustine, speaking of the sacrament of the manna, states—

'He says, "they ate the same spiritual meat." 'What means "the same," but that which we also eat? It had been sufficient to 'say that they ate spiritual meat. He says, "the same." I know 'not how to understand the words "the same," but as meaning that 'which we also eat. What, then, says somebody, was this that 'manna which I now receive? Then nothing new has now come, if

'it already was before. Therefore the offence of the cross is made 'void. (21 111.) I would say, therefore, briefly, whoever in the 'manna understood Christ, ate the same spiritual meat that we do. 'Therefore they drank the same drink as we do, but spiritual; that 'is, that which is taken by faith, not that which is drunk by the 'body, you have heard that it was the same drink. "The rock was "'Christ;" for there was not one Christ then, and another now.' (21 112.)

A more direct and conclusive answer could not well be given to Dr Pusey's argument. (35 31.) Perhaps he did not know this well known and important part of Augustine's writings, for he says, 'I have not knowingly omitted anything,' (35 41), and he has omitted this.

6. Dr Pusey has received also a direct answer from Theodoret, who says—

'If the things of the Jews were a type of our things, which he confesses and does not deny, what need was there of a lamb of a year 'old after the sacrifice of the Lamb without spot, who hath taken away 'the sin of the world? and what was the use of the feast of unleavened 'bread, after the heavenly Bread? or of the typical passover after the 'spiritual Passover? But he hears not the divine apostle saying, "'Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with "'the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened "'bread of sincerity and truth. For Christ our passover is sacrificed "'for us." Nor does he hear the Lord speaking to His disciples when 'He said, "This is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me." And, "This is my blood which is shed for you "'for the remission of sins."' (23 21.)

Here manifestly Theodoret has anticipated the argument of Dr Pusey, viz., that as the sacraments of the law were shadows and types, those of the gospel must be realities, and that consequently when Christ said, 'This is my body,' He meant 'to express a spiritual reality,' &c. (35 31); and has distinctly declared, on the testimony of Scripture, that as the Jewish passover was a type of Christ, so the Christian passover is a type of Him also, and no more contains the reality than the Jewish passover did. This is very fully shown throughout the voluminous writings of Augustine, and the following are adduced as specimens. The fuller accounts will be found in the Catena.

7. Augustine states that the Jewish sacramental rites 'were 'promises of things to be fulfilled;' Christian sacramental rites 'are tokens of things which are fulfilled.' (21 38.) No

one pretends that the Jewish tokens were the things which were to be fulfilled ; no one ought to pretend that the Christian tokens are the things which have been fulfilled. In the same answer to Faustus, Augustine, anticipating those who, because the signs and sacraments have been changed since the coming of Christ, conclude that the things of the signs or sacraments must be changed also, argues thus :

‘ For if the sounds of words by which we speak are changed for the time, and the same things one while are announced about to be done, and at another as done, as these very two words which I have spoken, “ about to be done ” and “ done,” these neither being equal intervals of delays, nor are they sounded with the same or as many letters or syllables. What wonder is it if the future passion and resurrection of Christ were promised by one kind of marks of mysteries, and the same when accomplished, are announced by another kind, since indeed the very words “ about to be done ” and “ done,” “ about to suffer ” and “ having suffered,” can neither be extended equally nor sounded alike. For what else are all corporal sacraments but, as it were, certain visible words, very holy, indeed, but nevertheless mutable and transient.’ (21 39.)

Even yet more to our point he states, ‘ For now it is not promised that He should be born, should suffer and should rise, which those sacraments of the Jews in a certain manner proclaimed aloud, but now it is announced that He was born, hath suffered, hath risen, which these sacraments which are performed by Christians now proclaim aloud.’ (21 40.) Again, referring to the sacrifice of Christ, he states, ‘ The flesh and blood of this sacrifice before the coming of Christ was promised, by sacrifices of resemblances ; in the passion of Christ it was declared in the reality itself ; after Christ’s ascension it is solemnized by a memorial sacrament.’ (21 42.) The candid reader cannot fail to draw the right inference from these plain statements. Augustine speaks of the sacraments of the Church in the wilderness as being the same in mystery and signification as those in the Christian Church. Thus he says, ‘ In mystery, therefore, theirs was the same meat and drink as ours, but also in signification the same, not in form. All, indeed, ate the same spiritual meat and drank the same spiritual drink, that is to say, something spiritual in signification.’ (21 53.) He then proceeds to show that in Jewish times, ‘ although all the sacraments were common ; grace, which is the virtue of

‘ the sacraments, was not common to all; just as in our times, the
 ‘ laver or washing of regeneration [meaning outward baptism]
 ‘ is common, but the grace itself of which these same are the
 ‘ sacraments, by which grace the members of the body of Christ
 ‘ are to reign together with their Head, is not common to all.’

(21 54.) The grace or virtue of a sacrament means that of which the sacrament is a sign, but only those in the Christian Church as well as in the Jewish Church who rightly received the sacraments, received the grace or virtue of them, namely, the things signified thereby. He tells us expressly that the manna signified Christ, the Bread which came down from heaven, and that the altar, meaning the sacramental bread, signifies the same Person. ‘ Those were sacraments. In signs ‘ they were diverse, in the thing signified they are alike.’ (21 77.) He further states that the meat of the wilderness as spiritual was the same as ours, ‘ for as corporal it was ‘ another, because they ate manna, we something else [meaning eucharistic material bread]; but they ate the spiritual ‘ meat which we do. In the visible form they drank one ‘ thing, we drink another, which, however, signifies this same ‘ thing in its spiritual virtue.’ (21 77.) Referring to the same thing in another homily, he repeats the same sentiments, though the form of expression is varied. (21 94.) He again, if possible more emphatically, teaches that the very same spiritual food which the devout Christian eats in the sacrament was really eaten by the pious Israelite in the wilderness, thus anticipating the very objection of Dr Pusey. (See secs. 4 and 5 above.) Nothing is more certain than that in the opinion of Augustine ‘ the rock ’ was as much Christ as the consecrated symbols are, but Augustine affirms that they who say that the rock was Christ in proper signification, blaspheme. To that and other metaphors regarded after the same manner as by Augustine, Ælfric adds the word bread. (27 5.) Verily, according to the most accurate teaching of Augustine, the manna and rock in the wilderness stood exactly in the same relation to Christ as the consecrated elements do in the Eucharist, and so taught Bertram in answer to Paschasius. (Ch. viii. 7, 13, 16, 17.)

8. The Fathers generally believed the Omnipresence of

Christ before as well as after His incarnation. Their views on this point in contrast with the Protestant Divines of the present day are most striking, and young divines of this school could not be otherwise than deeply impressed with the vast amount of evidence adduced by Dr Pusey in his 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers respecting the sacramental presence of Christ, but had Dr Pusey, or any one else, given 400 pages of extracts from the same source where other modes of Christ's presence are spoken of as real and efficacious as in the sacrament, these same young Protestant Divines would come to the just conclusion, that although the Fathers say much respecting Christ in the sacrament, yet they say quite as much respecting His being with believers apart from the sacrament. And if they speak so distinctly of Christ being present with His people apart from the sacrament, as we shall now show they do, we should at least expect they would say as much respecting His being with His people in the sacrament.

9. The Word of God revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures, whether through the medium of spoken or written signs, is entitled by the Fathers the Word of God, in the same sense as the Lord Jesus Christ is, and they plainly teach that He can be alike received in the Holy Scriptures as in the sacrament. Origen and Augustine are special cases in point. Origen on the words, 'She hath wrought a good work on me,' (Matt. xxvi. 10) remarks, 'showing that he who pours ointment on the Word of God, that is, who joins actual obedience with that word, that man worketh a good work. For the Word adorned with obedience and right actions is rendered, as it were, fragrant, filled with all sweetness of precious ointments.' (*In Epis. ad Rom.*, lib. ii. 5, tom. vi. pp. 84, 85.) Respecting this commentary Mr Keble has correctly said, 'Here would seem at first sight a confusion between the two senses of "THE WORD," standing sometimes for the Scriptures, sometimes for the Person of our Lord. But the difficulty will perhaps vanish on considering that the Word written or spoken was regarded by Origen as one among many forms, in which the personal Word vouchsafes to communicate Himself to His servants.' (*On the Mysticism attributed to the early Fathers of the Church*, No. LXXXIX. of the Tracts for

the Times, p. 129.) He further states, 'Whoever will consider and follow out these and similar hints, will see reason perhaps to excuse many things which a hasty reader of the Fathers would call over bold and fanciful, he will understand how Origen might affirm that there are in fact as many different manifestations of the Word, as many different Christs as there are believers; and again, that those who rest content with the mere outward meaning of the gospel history, not recollecting as they go on that in the same Jesus they live, and move, and have their spiritual being, that He is one with them, and they with Him.' (*Ibid* pp. 134, 135.)

10. Mr Keble also cites a passage from Augustine containing similar sentiments to those of Origen. "We that are made the body of Christ, let us not fail to recognize our own voice in the psalms and other scriptures: our own voice, because it is the voice of Him in whom we are all made one. Wheresoever in those books, wheresoever in those scriptures, I am journeying and panting for breath, in that sweat of our face which is part of our sentence as men—Christ is there, openly or secretly to meet and refresh me. It is He Himself who, by the very difficulty which I sometimes have in finding Him, inflames my longing, so that what I do find of His I may eagerly suck in, and retain to my soul's health, absorbed in my very joints and marrow.'" (*Ibid.*, p. 182.)

11. A considerable portion of Augustine's writings proves to certainty that in his mind he frequently made no distinction between Christ and the truth of Scripture, calling each the Word of God. Thus in his Commentary on the 37th Psalm (21 50), he states that the righteous from the beginning of the world have had Christ for their Head, and He has had them for His body, and the spiritual bread by which they were supplied, he explains as the Word of God, and again as the bread of the Word which as much applies to the words of Christ as to Himself. His Commentary on the 104th Psalm is still more to the point. He represents Christ as bread, and as proceeding from Peter and Paul and from the other stewards of the truth, and again as the Bread which came down from heaven, and as the Word of

God out of the apostles. (21 60.) But what is most of all to our point he states in the commentary on the same psalm, 'Ye remember, beloved, that although there be one language of God spread abroad in all the Scriptures, and though one Word doth sound through many mouths of the saints, which, since It is God with God in the beginning, hath not in that respect syllables, because It hath not times; and though we ought not to wonder, that on account of our infirmity It hath descended to the particles of our sounds, since It hath descended to assume the infirmity of our body.' (21 64.)

12. The Word of God as a title of Christ he regards as being not necessarily different from the doctrine of Christ: thus he says,

'The Word, then, both is God, and is the Word of a doctrine that is steadfast, not being capable of being sounded by syllables, and fleeting, but abiding with the Father, to which abiding doctrine let us be converted, admonished by the sounds that pass away. For that which doth admonish, doth not call us, albeit itself a transient thing, to things transitory. We are admonished to love God. What I have this moment said, syllables made the whole of it: by percussion they struck the air to reach your sense of hearing, in sounding they passed away; yet ought not that which I admonish you, to pass away; because He whom I have admonished you to love doth not pass away; and when ye, admonished by transient sounds, shall be converted unto Him, neither shall ye pass away, but with the Abiding ye shall abide. This, then, is in the Doctrine, the great, the deep, and eternal reality which abideth; to which all things do call us that in temporal manner pass away, when they are significant of good, and are not uttered in falsehood. For all the utterances that we make in sounds signify something that is not sound. It is not the sound, *Deus* (God), consisting of two brief syllables that is God: not two short syllables that we worship, and two short syllables that we adore, and two short syllables that we long to arrive unto; which well nigh cease to sound before they have begun; nor in sounding them is there place for the second until the first have passed. There remains, therefore, that great essence which we call *Deus* (God), though the sound remain not when we say *Deus*. So mark ye the Doctrine of Christ, and ye will arrive unto the Word of God; and when ye shall have arrived unto the Word of God, mark this, "The Word was God;" and ye shall see that it was truly said, "My doctrine;" mark also of whom it is the Word, and ye shall see that it was rightly said, "Is not mine," &c. (*Expo. in Evan. Joannis*, tract. xxix. tom. ix. p. 100.)

13. How general this teaching of Origen and Augustine was,

appears from a homily of Aquinas. Thus he says, 'The *Word of God*, which the saints willingly hear, is threefold. 1. Eternal, "In the beginning was the Word." (John i. 1.) 2. Mental, "A word (*verbum*) was secretly brought to me." (Job iv. 12.) 3. Vocal, "Man shall not live by bread, &c., but by every word that proceedeth," &c., (Matt. iv. 4.) The first they hear by faith: "He that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." (John xi. 25.) The second by inspiration, "I will hear what God the Lord will speak." (Psa. lxxxv. 8). The third by preaching, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." (Luke viii. 8.) *Lenten Homilies, Hom. x.*

14. If it can be shown that Origen, Augustine, and other Fathers, were entirely wrong in their teaching respecting 'the Word,' that would not in the least invalidate their testimony in regard to their belief of the presence of Christ with His people, as well by His Word as by His sacrament. It remains that we now give practical illustrations from several of the Fathers. Origen speaks of receiving the Word of God in the sacrament; but the question is, How does he understand the phrase 'The Word,' and how is 'the Word' received? In addition to what we have already adduced from Origen respecting 'the Word,' the reader is especially requested to consider well his sentiments as given in 11 3, 52, and he will be better prepared to appreciate and comprehend what Origen teaches in regard to receiving the Word, whether in or out of the sacrament. Thus he says, 'That Bread which God the Word owneth to be His body, is the Word which nourishes or strengthens souls, the Word coming from God the Word, and bread from the heavenly Bread.' (11 12.) Here Origen plainly interprets Christ's body represented by the consecrated bread, as Bread from the Bread of life, and the Word from God the Word, which alike can be received through the medium of the written or spoken words of Scripture. The texts which he cites to illustrate his statement confirm this view of the case. (11 12.)

15. It is important to notice the manner in which Dr Pusey cites this portion of Origen's writings, which, as it relates to the institution and nature of the Lord's Supper, is of singular importance. Yet Dr Pusey has only cited in the ordinary way

one passage therefrom, which will be found denoted in the usual way. (11 12.) The other passage we are now to consider is merely added as a foot-note in smaller type (11 13), and is prefaced thus: 'In the sequel is a passage of great difficulty, in which Origen seems to be contrasting the outward element, as considered by itself, and the inward presence of our Lord.' We have sufficiently noticed elsewhere this spurious nomenclature of an inward presence in an outward element. That the passage is one of great difficulty, if Dr Pusey's doctrine of the real presence was verily believed by the early Church, and must be so interpreted as not to contradict it, is freely admitted. We shall find, however, the passage to be plain enough if we allow Origen to be his own interpreter, and bid the outrageous interpreters of the school of Paschasius to stand aside.

16. Origen says, 'For God the Word did not call that visible bread which He held in His hands His body, but the Word in the mystery of which that bread was to be broken.' (11 13.) The phrase 'in the mystery,' is equivalent to the phrase 'in the sacrament;' in other words, mystically or sacramentally. According to this statement, our Lord called the consecrated bread the Word,—sacramentally or mystically, of which the bread was employed. The same thing which he affirms of the bread he also affirms of the wine; and of both he says, 'For the body of God the Word, or His blood—what else can it be but the Word "which strengtheneth," and the wine "which maketh glad the heart."' (11 13.) Here the term Word is not intended to denote the Lord's person; but, as he said above, "the Word from the Word," which is exactly the same in sense as the Bread from Him who is called the Bread of Life. This is confirmed from the manner in which he applies Psalm civ. 15. If this interpretation of Origen is to be taken so as for him not to contradict himself, he did not mean absolutely to teach that the bread was the Word. It is rather a commentary on the word body, which is to be understood with that latitude. Ruffinus also speaks of the virtue of the blood of Christ, which he explains as the virtue of the Word. (20 3.) Augustine, too, in explaining the signification of the Eucharist, represents the work of Christ in such a light to the

believer as to include not only His death, but all that He has done and promised to do as the Word of God, (21 7.)

17. Origen shows that the Word, from Christ 'the Word,' can be received through the spoken or written words of Scripture as well as through the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; or, as Augustine calls it, 'a visible word,' in contradistinction to the word spoken; and we might as well add, in accordance with the teaching of Origen, the Bread from Christ the Bread of Life, can as well be received through the Scriptures as through the Sacrament, which is the common doctrine of the Fathers. In this very exposition of the institution and nature of the Lord's Supper he says, 'The bread is the word of righteousness, on eating which souls are strengthened.' (11 14.) At the same time he shows also that the Sacrament, like the Scriptures, is the medium through which faith in Christ is exercised: 'So that we, believing in the Son of God that He was born and suffered for us according to the flesh, may be saved, not in righteousness, in which alone, without faith in the Passion of Christ, there could be no salvation.' (11 14.)

18. The close of this most important exposition still more confirms the view which we have given of his teaching. To show the import of the shedding of Christ's blood, he says: 'Learn with that Word also which has been written, "Because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts." But if the blood of the New Testament is shed abroad in our hearts for the remission of sins, that drinkable blood having been shed abroad in our hearts, all sins are remitted and blotted out.' (11 17.) He concludes, 'Nor do thou marvel, since He Himself is both the bread, and He eats the bread with us; He Himself is both the drink of the fruit of the vine, and He drinks it with us. For God the Word is omnipotent, and is called by divers names, and He Himself is innumerable according to the multitude of virtues, since He is every virtue and Himself is one.' (11 18.) Origen teaches that as in the sacrament Christ can be received in every form required by the devout communicant, so he teaches that He can also be received after the same manner in the Scriptures. This may be seen in 11 21, where Christ is called the Bread of the

Gospel, and is represented like the ancient manna, as suited to every taste. He also speaks of 'the virtue of the blood of 'the Word' being recognised and understood, evidently meaning the truth of Holy Scripture. Again, speaking of Christ as the first fruits who is received by the faithful, and as spiritual meat, which, the more it is taken the more it increases, he adds, 'For as much more thou dost take the Word of God, as 'much more earnestly thou dost eat this food, so much more 'copiously shall it abound in thee.' (11 33.) What is more plain than that Origen here teaches that Christ, or the Word of God, is received by the faithful, not only in the sacrament but also in the Holy Scriptures.

19. He also distinctly states that 'we are said to drink 'the blood of Christ, not only in the way of the sacraments, 'but also when we receive His words.' (11 34). Dr Pusey for some reason or other has obscured the meaning of Origen by translating *sermones* (words), as if it were *verbum* (word), when it is certain that it is not the Word, meaning Christ Himself, but the words or discourses of Christ. This is put out of the region of doubt, for Origen adds, 'He therefore 'Himself has been wounded whose blood we drink, that is, we 'receive the words of His doctrine.' He still further adds, 'But nevertheless they also have been wounded who have 'preached to us His Word, for we also read their words, that 'is the words of His apostles.' (11 35). Again he speaks of the flesh of the Word of God being eaten, and His blood drunk by the true Israel, but in this case the medium of participation is, the branches of the vine, that is, the disciples of Christ; and that we may not mistake what he means, he says, 'The fruit of these branches is deservedly called the 'blood of those who are wounded, which we drink from 'their words and doctrine.' (11 36.) Elsewhere Origen interprets the body of the Lord in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as denoting the truth of Holy Scripture in regard to Christ's saving doctrines. (11 33.) He expressly explains eating the flesh of the Word of God as receiving the saving doctrines of Scripture. 'That which we only speak is the 'flesh of the Word of God. . . . If we speak what is 'perfect, what is healthy, what is strong, we place before you

‘the flesh of the Word of God to eat.’ (11 37.) He speaks in the same style in another part of his writings. (11 47).

20. Origen claims the same regard or even greater, for the Scriptures which he calls the word of God, as he does for the consecrated bread which he calls Christ’s body. (11 22). Yet even more to our point, if possible, he states, ‘Our Lord and Saviour says, “Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood ye have no life in you, for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.” Because Jesus therefore is altogether and wholly clean, His whole flesh is food, because every work of His is holy, and every word of His is true, and therefore His flesh is true food, and His blood is true drink. For with the flesh and blood of His own Word as with clean food and drink, He gives drink to, and recruits the whole race of men. After the flesh of Him Peter is clean food, and Paul, and all the Apostles.’ (11 28). Nothing could be more against eating in any literal sense the human body or flesh of Christ in the sacrament. He expressly states that such language is figurative, saying, ‘Acknowledge that they are figures of the things which are written in the inspired book, and therefore, as spiritual, and not as carnal, examine and understand, &c. For if, according to the letter, thou followest the very thing which is said, “Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,” this letter kills.’ (11 29). Again he says, ‘Stop not at the blood of the flesh, but learn rather the blood of the Word and hear Himself saying to thee, “This is my blood which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins.”’ (11 30). Here manifestly Origen, by the phrase ‘the blood of the Word,’ means not the actual blood which Christ shed, but rather what He has taught respecting Himself, and the shedding of His blood, in the Holy Scriptures. Elsewhere, speaking of the necessity of receiving the consecrated elements in a devout manner, he by way of contrast remarks, ‘How much more rightly and devoutly may we say this also concerning the Word of God,’ (11 31) meaning Christ Himself in the Scriptures.

21. Origen teaches beyond all question that our blessed Lord was as really present, as the Word of God, with the prophets and saints of the former dispensation, as He is with

His disciples at the present day. (11 45.) The reader will do well to notice in what sense Origen understood the title, 'the Word of God,' and how 'there is to each the presence of 'the Word.' We are now come to our last extract from the writings of Origen on this point, and a most valuable one it is, showing that in his mind the very idea of receiving Christ the Word of God by the natural mouth would be an absurdity ; yet, Dr Pusey's gross Paschasian notion of the real presence in the consecrated elements involves such a reception, and he has most unfairly cited Origen, as may be seen in our catena, as if that were his common belief, but nothing could be farther from the truth. No one can suppose that in regard to Christ's being our 'Wisdom,' our 'Truth,' our 'Life,' our 'Righteousness,' our 'Sanctification,' that we receive Him by the natural mouth. No more do we receive Christ as the Word of God after that manner ; the very idea would have been to the exalted mind of Origen a grovelling carnal conception, for he says, 'the Son of God in respect of the Word being God, 'which was in the beginning with God, no one will logically 'suppose to be contained in any place, nor yet in respect of 'his being "Wisdom," or "Truth," or the "Life," or "Righteousness," or "Sanctification," or "Redemption ;" for as 'these properties do not require space to be able to act or to 'operate, but each one of them is to be understood as meaning those individuals who participate in His virtue of working. . . . In respect of being the "Word" or "Wisdom," 'or all other things, Christ was in Paul, . . . who will doubt 'that He was in a similar manner in Peter and in John, and 'in each one of the saints.' (11 52.)

22. Cyril speaks of the sacrament in regard to what is seen as the food of the body, but he speaks of the Word as the food of the soul. (15 12.)

23. Ambrose expressly states that 'The Old Testament is 'the Word of Christ, the New Testament is the Word of 'Christ,' and exhorts all to drink the cup of the Old Testament and the New Testament, because we drink Christ, in both, as the Vine, the Rock, the Fountain of Life, the River and Peace. Drink Christ that thou mayest drink the blood by which thou wast redeemed. Drink Christ that thou mayest

drink His words. (17 6.) Again he says, ‘But the bread which Jesus broke is mystically the Word of God and discourse concerning Christ, which bread, whilst it is divided is increased.’ (17 11.) Still more to the point he states,

‘That “man doth not live by bread alone, but on every word of God,” in which there is the nourishment of heavenly life. But the Word of God is the Lord Christ, as the Evangelist says, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.” Whoever, therefore is fed with the Word of Christ requires no earthly food. Nor can he regard the stomach who receives the nourishment of the heavenly Word, for it is the very nourishment which feeds the soul, which fattens the inward powers, when we receive the food of the never failing eloquence from the Divine Scriptures. It is the very food which gives eternal life and drives from us the snare of diabolical temptation. But that the reading of the holy writings is life, the Lord witnesses, saying, “The words which I speak unto you “they are spirit and they are life.”’ (17 17.)

Doubtless, Ambrose here speaks of as complete a participation of Christ in His Word by the believer as in His sacrament.

24. Jerome states, ‘The hunger of the Jewish people to hear the Word of God had not yet been satisfied with that Bread which came down from heaven.’ (18 30.) Again, he says, ‘For the true food and drink which is derived from the Word of God [meaning the Lord Jesus Christ] is knowledge of the Scriptures.’ (18 49.) Jerome, or some one under his name, speaks of the Word of God both in the Eucharist and in the Scriptures, and as alike to be received from both; and since he says, ‘“he who doth not eat my flesh and drink my “blood,” although also it can be understood in the mystery. Yet more truly is the Word of the Scriptures the body of Christ and the Divine doctrine is His blood.’ (18 50.) Again he says, ‘In the flesh of Christ which is the Word of doctrine, that is the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures,’ there is food adapted to every palate, and suited to every want, even as in the manna of old. If plain language is capable of being understood, Jerome teaches that Christ is as really present in His word as in His sacrament, and may be as fully received from the one as the other.

25. Other Fathers interpret the body of Christ in the sacrament to mean what is taught in Scripture respecting

Christ. Gaudentius in a series of discourses explains the nature and institution of the Lord's Supper to the newly baptized, showing that to receive the body of Christ or the flesh of the immaculate Lamb is to receive the leading doctrines of Holy Scripture. Thus he says, 'The whole body of the Divine Scriptures as well of the Old as of the New Testament 'contains the Son of God.' He then goes on to say, 'Therefore, since we have called the members of the Lamb of God 'His Scriptures, let us see what is the head with the feet and 'entrails,' which he also explains. (19 5.) The bones of the Lamb he considers the strongest parts of Scripture, for the breaking of which he condemns the Scribes and Pharisees, and concludes thus, 'Ye make the Word of God of none effect 'that ye may establish your own traditions.' (19 6.) Again he says, 'We are bidden to eat, in the mysteries, the Head of 'His Divinity, together with the feet of His Incarnation, and 'the inward parts; that we may believe all things alike as 'they have been delivered, not breaking that most solid bone 'of Him. "This is my body, this is my blood." ' (19 9.)

26. Ruffinus speaks of the virtue of the blood, that is, the virtue of the Word of God, and says, 'The flesh of the 'Word of God is the meat of the perfect, so also His blood is 'the cup of the perfect,' and also speaks of 'eating the pure, 'and immaculate, and solid meat of God's Word, nor suffer 'the soul to be fed with the milk of babes.' (20 3-5).

27. Augustine plainly teaches that Christ can as well be received in His words as in His sacraments. He says, 'He is 'not without power to give to believers Himself the true 'Bread from heaven, which the manna did signify, wherefore 'the Word of God feeds incorruptibly the corruptible, the 'which in order that men might eat, He became flesh and 'dwelt among us. For Himself, the Bread, by means of the 'evangelical clouds, is being rained over the whole world, and, 'the hearts of preachers, like heavenly doors, being opened, is 'being preached not to a murmuring and tempting synagogue, 'but to a Church believing and putting hope in Him. He is 'able also to feed the feeble faith of such as tempt not, but 'believe, with the signs of words uttered by the flesh and 'speeding through the air.' (21 55, 56). Dr Pusey and the

whole tribe of Paschasians might as well maintain that whole Christ, God and man, is actually and really in His spoken or written word, as they maintain that He is in His sacrament, for Augustine here plainly teaches that the flesh of Christ may be eaten in His words. With Augustine, as we have seen, the Word of God as a title of Christ, and the Word of God as revealed in the Scriptures, were equivalent phrases. Thus on the words, 'Man shall not live on bread alone, but 'on every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God,' he remarks, 'If the Word of God, by which all things were made, 'was not bread, He would not say, "I am the bread which "came down from heaven."' (21 57). He then who rightly receives Christ's Word, receives Christ Himself, even as he who rightly receives the sacrament does the same thing. Doubtless, the communicant who rightly receives the sacrament of Christ's body receives therewith the Bread of Life, Christ the Word of God. But Augustine affirms the same thing of those who rightly receive the words of the apostles and others. Thus he says, 'What bread? Christ. Out of 'what earth? From Peter, from Paul, and other stewards of 'the truth.' Again he asks, 'That bread may be brought 'forth out of what earth? The Word of God out of the 'apostles, out of the stewards of God's sacraments.' (21 60). Interpreting Psalm civ. 15, as most of the fathers do as relating to the spiritual food of the Lord's Supper, but by no means necessarily connecting that spiritual food with those outward signs, he plainly shows that the same food can be received as well apart from the sacrament as in it. Thus he says, 'To understand it therefore of the bread as thou dost 'understand it of the wine, hunger inwardly, thirst inwardly "Blessed are they," saith our Lord, "who hunger and thirst "after righteousness." That bread is righteousness, that wine 'is righteousness. It is truth. Christ is truth. "I am," 'he said, "the living Bread, who came down from heaven." "I am the vine, ye are the branches." "And bread "strengthens man's heart."' (21 61). That Augustine should teach so plainly that believers may receive their Saviour—the Bread of Life—the Word of God, in His written or spoken words, is obvious from the following general

remarks upon this very Psalm, 'Ye remember, beloved, that 'although there be one language of God spread abroad in all 'the Scriptures, and though one Word doth sound through 'many mouths of the saints, which since It is God with God 'in the beginning, hath not in that respect syllables, because 'It hath not times we ought not to wonder, that on account 'of our infirmity, It hath descended to the particles of our 'sounds, since It descended to assume the infirmity of our 'body.' (21 64).

28. Without alluding to Christ the living Bread being received in the sacrament, he speaks of Him as being manifested in the gospel, and to be sought in the Prophets, and states, 'So long as Christ is preached to us, though it be with 'labour and sweat, yet have we bread given us to eat.' (21 66.) Augustine in the most distinct manner possible teaches that Christ may be eaten without the sacrament, which even the canon law of the Church of Rome admits. (See ch. ix. 161-164.) Thus he says, to believe on Christ is to eat the living bread, and remarks, 'Why make ready thy teeth and 'belly? Believe and thou hast eaten.' (21 69.) Not only with Origen does Augustine teach that Christ may be received by faith through His words and not necessarily through His sacraments, but also that He may be received as the Righteousness of God. Let not, however, the reader misunderstand the phrase as employed by Origen, and then he need not misunderstand it as employed by Augustine. Origen speaking of Wisdom, Truth, and Righteousness, &c., as titles of Christ, remarks respecting them, 'Each one of them is to be understood as meaning those individuals who partake of His virtue of working.' (11 52.) Augustine represents Christ the Bread of life as righteousness, and remarks, 'Now that Christ is 'made unto us righteousness, as the Apostle Paul declareth, 'and, therefore, whoso hungereth after this Bread, let him 'hunger after righteousness; only it must be that righteousness 'which cometh down from heaven.' (21 71.) How this righteousness is to be understood, Augustine in the same place teaches, and even yet more plainly in one of his sermons, 'This then is the righteousness of God, as it is called "the "salvation of the Lord," not whereby the Lord is saved, but

‘ which He giveth to them whom he saveth ; so too the grace
 ‘ of God through Jesus Christ our Lord is called the righteous-
 ‘ ness of God, not as that whereby the Lord is righteous, but
 ‘ whereby He justifieth those whom of ungodly He maketh
 ‘ righteous.’ (*De verbis Apos. Sermo* ii. c. 8, tom. x. p. 95.)
 Here assuredly Augustine teaches that to receive Christ the
 Bread of life in one aspect of it is to receive the righteousness
 of God through Christ, in other words, justification by faith.
 It is certain he cannot be here referring to receiving Christ,
 or eating Him as the Bread of life in the sacrament, but re-
 ceiving Him by faith through His words ‘ unto justification of
 ‘ life,’ receiving Him as really as in the sacrament, in the one
 case receiving Him in order to life, in the other commemorat-
 ing the event and receiving life more abundantly. That
 Christ can be truly received without a sacramental reception,
 Augustine yet further shows, ‘ For to believe on Him this is to
 ‘ eat the living bread. He that believeth eateth.’ He further
 tells us, that ‘ we run not to Christ by walking, but by believing.’
 (21 72.) How effectually, in the mind of Augustine, Christ
 can be received so as to be incorporated in Him by faith
 without the sacrament, appears from the manner in which he
 represents Christ as saying, ‘ He that believeth on me hath
 ‘ me. . . . He then that believeth on me, saith He, goeth
 ‘ into me, and he that goeth into me hath me. And what is
 ‘ to have me ? To have everlasting life.’ (21 73.)

29. An objector might well ask, if, according to the
 teaching of these Fathers, Christ is as much present in the
 Holy Scriptures as He is in His sacraments, ought not these
 Fathers to receive with as much reverence the written or
 spoken signs of the Word of God, as they do the sacra-
 mental signs of the same Divine Person ? This was what
 they really did. Thus Origen says, ‘ But if ye use so great
 ‘ caution, and rightly use it, in receiving His body, how do
 ‘ you think it a less guilt to have neglected the Word of God,
 ‘ than His body.’ (11 22.) It appears to have been the
 general, if not the universal practice, to pray standing on the
 Lord’s Day and during the time between Easter and Pente-
 cost. But this was also the usual position of receiving the
 consecrated elements in the Eucharist. About the middle of

the third century, in a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Xystus, Bishop of Rome, speaking of one who had often communicated among the faithful, he says: 'For one who had been in the habit of hearing thanksgiving, and repeating the Amen, and *standing at the table*, and extending his hand to receive the sacred elements, &c.' (*Church History of Eusebius*, Book vii., ch. 9.) Precisely in the same manner did the faithful receive the spoken signs of the Word of God, viz., the Holy Scriptures. This we learn from the discourses of Augustine. Thus, in a sermon on the 84th Psalm, he remarks, 'And if the word which we now dispense to you keeps your weak flesh standing so long, what will be the effect of that joy? how will it change us? "For we shall be like him, since we shall see Him as He "is."' (*Enar. Ps. lxxxiii. (lxxxiv.), tom viii. p. 376.*) In another discourse entitled 'Sermon to the People, wherein he argueth against the games and shows, &c.,' founded on the 147th Psalm, he states: 'If there be nothing in the body which resists and rebels, let us finish the Psalm. I never find you weary, yet I fear, God knoweth, lest I be a burden to you, or to some of the brethren, and I see how zealously many of you demand of me this toil and effort, which, I believe, will not be unfruitful in the Lord. I rejoice that ye find such pleasure in the truth of the Word of God, that your good zeal in what is good, and concerning what is good, surpasses the zeal of the madmen who are in the amphitheatre. Would they still be at their show, if they had to stand so long? Therefore, brethren, let us hear the rest, since ye so will.' (*Enar. Ps. cxlvii., tom viii. p. 705.*) From the discourse which has come down to us, Augustine must have preached upwards of an hour before he made the above remark, and at least twenty minutes after. His audience stood thus long not merely to hear the Word read, but also to hear it preached. This, doubtless, must have been a great burthen to some, as we learn from another discourse of Augustine, and in which he suggested some relief to delicate women, and at the same time impressed on the minds of his audience that the Word of God ought to be esteemed with the same regard as the body of Christ, and

said : 'That the Word of God is not less important than the body of Christ, and on that account we observe, with as much care, when the body of Christ is ministered by us, that nothing of it fall from our hands to the ground, as with care we observe, lest the Word of God which is given out by us, whilst we either think or speak anything, pass away from our heart. Because he will not be less guilty who hears the Word of God negligently, than he who in his negligence permits the body of Christ to fall to the ground.' (21 110.) They alike stood to pray and to receive the consecrated elements. In the mind of Jerome, however, receiving the body of Christ was regarded as a more important religious act than that of prayer. (18 7.) But if receiving the body of Christ was what Paschasius and his disciples represented it as being, such a man as Jerome could have raised no question respecting it.

30. According to the deliberate judgment of Origen and Augustine, those sounds or signs which, by a figure of speech, we call the Word of God, were to be regarded with as much reverence as those consecrated symbols which, by a like figure of speech, we call the body and blood of Christ. Dr Pusey says : 'In the traditional custom of bowing to the altar (when the Holy Sacrament is not there), we mean only reverence to it, as having been "the throne of God."' (*Eirenicon* p. 206.) In Cyprian's time the reading of the Scriptures was regarded as a very solemn act, and the place from which they were read, from the manner in which he speaks of it, must have been one of honour, if not of veneration. Speaking of one whom he had ordained to the order of a reader, he says :—

'But for the present I thought right that he should begin with the office of reading. For nothing is more fitting for that voice, which has confessed the Lord in a glorious utterance, than to sound Him forth in the solemn reading of the Divine word, than after the sublime words which spoke out the martyr of Christ, to read the gospel of Christ, whence martyrs are made ; to come to the pulpit (*pulpitum*) after the scaffold ; in one place to have been a spectacle to the multitude of gentiles, in the other to be beheld by the brethren ; there to have been heard amid the wondering amazement of the surrounding populace, here to be heard with the joy of the brotherhood.' (*Epist.* xxxviii., tom ii. p. 75.)

It is certain that, in the time of Origen, and as late as the time of Augustine, the Word of God, in its outward aspect, was treated with as much respect as the body of Christ, and the pulpit, of course, as a place would be in no respect inferior to the table. If Dr Pusey and others had as much regard for early antiquity as their professed principles would lead us to expect, and if bowing to a material object, whether of wood or stone, were in accordance with the moral law, and not a gross violation of it, then he and others who bow at an angle of a certain number of degrees to a table of wood or an altar of stone, where are, or are accustomed to be, the Body and Blood of Christ; so, on the same principle, he and others should bow at an angle of an increased number of degrees to the pulpit, or by whatever name, in more modern times, that place is called, where is, or is accustomed to be, the Word of Christ.

31. While the Fathers unmistakeably teach that Christ is present in the Holy Scriptures, they, as we should expect, also teach that His flesh, or body and blood, can as really be received by faith, apart from the sacrament, as in it. Ignatius says, 'Faith, that is, the flesh of the Lord, and in love, that is, the blood of Jesus Christ.' (3 3.) Again he says, 'I desire the Bread of God, the heavenly Bread of life, which is the Flesh of Jesus Christ, and I desire the drink of God, namely, His blood, which is incorruptible, love and eternal life.' (3 4.) Whatever Ignatius or any one in his name meant by these phrases, they are generally admitted to be unsacramental and figurative. Clement of Alexandria says, 'Nuriment is received both by bread and words.' (9 8.) Tertullian shows that 'Christ's own flesh' can 'be devoured in the hearing,' and 'be ruminated upon in the intellect,' and 'be digested by faith.' (10 6.)

32. Origen teaches, that 'the flesh of the Lamb' and the 'Bread of Life' are alike the 'Word of God,' meaning either Christ or the Holy Scriptures. The eating of the Lamb, the whole Lamb, he shows to be the acceptance of the entire body of the Scriptures. (11 2.) The same sentiment is fully stated by Gaudentius (19 5-9.) Origen after having definitely spoken of the consecration of the elements, and stated that of

their own intrinsic nature they do not sanctify the recipients, and remarked, 'This may be said of the typical and symbolical 'body';' goes on to say, 'But many things might be spoken 'concerning the Word Himself who became flesh and true 'food, of which he who eats shall live for ever.' (11 5.) Here, most assuredly, Origen speaks of a real and saving but unsacramental participation of the flesh of Christ as true food.

33. Lactantius says, 'Christ is the food and life of men, 'who believe in the flesh which He bore.' (13 1.) He speaks very distinctly of Christ being food and drink to the believer, but makes no allusion to the Lord's Supper. (13 2.)

34. Ambrose says, 'Therefore drink the cup both of the 'Old and New Testament, because thou drinkest Christ in 'both. Drink Christ, because He is the vine, the Rock, 'Fountain of life, the River, the Peace. Drink Christ, that 'thou mayest drink the blood by which thou wast redeemed, &c.' (17 6.) He further says, 'He eats that Bread which came 'down from heaven, who keeps those things which have been 'written.' (17 12.)

35. Jerome says, 'For they did eat in the Holy Scriptures 'the Bread that came down from heaven.' (18 40.) Again, 'We have only one good to feed on His flesh and to drink 'His blood not only in the mystery [that is in the Eucharist] 'but also in the reading of the Scriptures.' (18 49.) He yet further says, 'If when we hear the Word of God, the Word of 'God, and the flesh of Christ and His blood are poured into 'our ears, &c.' (18 51.)

36. Gaudentius states that not only in faith ought those who believe to eat the flesh of the Lamb, but also in the mystery. (19 15.) Here it is plainly implied that Christ may be eaten by faith without the sacrament.

37. It is certain from the teaching of Augustine that the body of Christ must be received before receiving it in the Lord's Supper. He states, '“ We being many are one body in '“ Christ” is the sacrifice of Christians, which body the Church 'celebrates in the sacrament of the altar wherein the same 'is shown, that in that oblation which the Church offers, itself 'is offered.' (21 28.) That is, the Church, the body of Christ, is offered, but it must be the body of Christ before it is offered.

The same idea is given (21 30.) Again he speaks of some who 'have eaten the body of Christ not in the sacrament only, 'but in reality, being placed in that very body of His of which 'the apostle says, "We being many are one bread, one body.'" (21 32.) Here it is implied beyond all question that the communicants must first be the body of Christ before they can rightly receive it in the Lord's Supper. Again referring to the same thing, he plainly states, 'He is not to be said to eat the body of Christ, who is not in the body of Christ.' (21 33.) What can be plainer than that before a communicant can receive the body of Christ in His Supper, he must first be of that body, and therefore must have received it before coming to the Supper. For more upon this point see chapter vii. 44, 45. Speaking of Christ the Bread of life which is the reality of which the sacrament is one of the sacred signs, he says, 'On this Bread of the word, you feed both day and night. 'For both when you hear it, and when you read it, you are 'feeding upon it, when you think upon it you are ruminating it.' (21 50.) Augustine says, that 'Righteousness is bread,' and asks 'Who is bread?' and answers, "'I am the living bread ' "which came down from heaven." Himself is the Bread of 'our heart,' (21 52.) Plainly Christ is the Bread of the believer's heart both in and out of the sacrament. According to Augustine, whether in, or apart from the sacrament, Christ is the constant food of the believer. (21 66.) He distinctly teaches that the flesh of Christ may be received by faith apart from the sacrament and by faith in the sacrament, but not in any case by the natural mouth, for he says, 'That is called 'flesh, which flesh receiveth not.' (21 79.) In a discourse on the body of the Lord, he shows that it is not actually receiving the flesh of Christ, but rather believing what He did in the flesh for us, and what he has taught us by His apostles. (21 88.) He says, 'The same who in their rage had killed 'Him, being changed, believed in Him; and the blood which, 'in their raging, they had shed, by believing they drank.' (21 93.)

38. Augustine teaches, 'If thou art a good man thou be-
'longest to the body which Peter denotes [the true Church],
'thou hast Christ both in the present and in the future,—in

'the present by faith, in the present by the sign, in the present by the sacrament of Baptism, in the present by the meat and drink of the altar.' (21 97.) According to this teaching Christ is as really present with a true believer by faith as He is present with him in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. As above, Augustine again speaks of drinking the blood of Christ by faith without the sacrament, 'Many of them believed, and the shedding of the blood of Christ was forgiven them. At first they shed it while they raged, now they drink it while they believed.' (21 103.) Augustine shows that if communicants have well received the consecrated elements they are what they have received (21 126), but he shows that in order to receive well they must be first made bread before they eat it, and he describes how this is accomplished, and then remarks, 'and ye are made bread, which is the body of Christ.' (21 126.)

39. The word bread is employed in the Old Testament metaphorically in the sense of food for the mind, or spiritual food. The Jews so understood and interpreted many parts of the Old Testament. Our Lord, then, in representing a saving knowledge of Himself, under the aspect of the Bread of life, was only carrying out a Jewish idea, perfectly familiar to the Jews, which Dr Wiseman himself admits. (33 2.) Now the Fathers in this respect went far beyond the Jews, for almost in every place in the Old Testament where they found the words bread, wine, and cup, they not only gave them a spiritual application, but an application to Christ, or blessings to be derived from Him. Paschasians lay their hands on the most rhetorical passages of this kind, and claim them not only as referring to the Eucharist, but as teaching their doctrine of the real presence, when very frequently there is no reference to the Eucharist at all, certainly no necessary reference, the reference often being to certain blessings which alike can be realized apart from, or in the Eucharist. One or two instances such as casually occur in the Catena will illustrate this point.

40. The words 'my cup runneth over,' or, rather, according to their versions of Scripture, 'thine inebriating cup how excellent it is,' (Psalm xxiii. 5), were commonly considered to be descriptive of blessings flowing from Christ. Origen so

applies the text, yet so as to show how contrary his doctrine was to that of Paschasius. (11 12, 25.) Eusebius makes a similar application of the same text which, with his remarks in connection therewith, is most fatal to the same heresy. (14 2.) Ambrose makes the like application, but apart from sacramental participation. (17 6.) Jerome looks upon the text as relating to what is sacramental, (18 20), but the cup is partaken of not from an altar, elevated by three or more steps, but from 'the Lord Jesus Christ on high,' and most certainly not by the natural mouth of the body as it and its fellow members are too fast bound to their mother earth for such a transcendent flight. Ruffinus considers the participation of the cup to be either through the medium of the Scriptures or the Paschal Supper. (20 8, 9). Theodoret so interprets and applies the text as to give no support to the doctrine of Paschasius. (23 9.)

41. In a commentary on the Psalms, commonly ascribed to Jerome, the inebriating cup is interpreted as meaning the word of God, and the effects produced when it is preached. (*Opera*, tom. viii. p. 32.) On the supposition that Christ imparted the same blessing through His Word as through His sacraments, the application of this text by the Fathers is simple enough, but otherwise it is inexplicable.

42. The text, 'And wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart,' (Psalm civ. 15.) is applied in the same manner. Origen regards the text as being descriptive either of a participation of Christ in the sacrament or apart from it. (11 1, 13, 14.) Ambrose seems to express the sentiments of Origen, and represents the wine and bread as the food and drink of the sacrament (17 15, the end), and the bread as being the bread of life which is also the food of the Scriptures. (17 17.) Jerome speaks of the participation in two places as if it might be either in or apart from the sacrament (18 25, 45), and in another place as the bread of the Scriptures. (18 43.) Augustine represents the bread and wine as spiritual, and as denoting blessings to be received as really apart from the sacrament as in it. (21 60, 61.) If the participation in the sacrament were what Dr Pusey and his school teach, these

Fathers could not have represented a like participation apart from the sacrament.

43. Another text is Jeremiah xi. 19, which, from the unanimous application of it by the Fathers to Christ is of considerable importance in the present controversy. As given in their versions, it is, 'But I as an innocent lamb led to the slaughter, knew not; against me they devised an evil device, saying, Come and let us put wood on his bread, and let us utterly destroy him from off the land of the living, and let his name be remembered no more.' (Jer. xi. 19.) Justin Martyr cites it and remarks, 'From these words it is demonstrated that the Jews deliberated about the Christ Himself, to crucify and put Him to death.' (*Dialog. cum Trypho Opera*, p. 232.) Here, doubtless, Justin applies the word bread to Christ personally, in no wise referring to sacramental bread or Christ sacramentally.

44. In proof 'that the Jews would fasten Christ to the cross,' Cyprian cites the same text, and, of course, as applying to Christ personally. (*Adver. Jud.*, lib. ii. c. 20, tom. i. pp. 44, 45.)

45. Tertullian, Cyprian's master, applying as he did the very same text against the Jews, remarks, 'For so Christ revealed calling his body bread, whose body the Prophet figured in bread.' (10 1.) We learn most certainly from Tertullian's application of this text, that Christ was bread in the same sense in the sacrament as he was in Jeremiah's prophecy of Him. Tertullian represents Jeremiah as calling Christ's body bread from the fact of his using the words, 'Let us put wood on his bread.' In what sense he understood Jeremiah to call Christ's body bread, his language shows, 'Whose body he figured in bread.' (10 1.) 'Whose body he figured into bread.' (10 10.) 'Bread was an ancient figure of the body of Christ.' 'What he meant bread to signify, calling His body bread.' (10 13.) But in this sense and in no other did Tertullian understand Christ's body to be bread in the Eucharist. With Jeremiah, as understood by Tertullian, bread was the figure; that of which it was the figure, was the body of Christ; so, according to Tertullian, consecrated bread in the Eucharist is a figure; that of which

it is a figure is the body of Christ. But the figure employed by Jeremiah was not the thing of which it was the figure, no more is it in the Eucharist. In the same manner in which Tertullian explains the language of Jeremiah, so he does that of Christ. 'So Christ revealed, calling his body bread, whose body the prophet before figured in bread.' (10 1.) 'Calling His body bread . . . gave the figure of His body to bread whose body the prophet aforetime figured into bread.' (10 10.) 'He made His own body that [bread] by saying, "This is my body," that is, a figure of my body.' 'If He pretended that His body was bread because He had in truth no body, He ought then to have given bread for us.' 'But why does He call His body bread?' (10 13.) No one pretends that Christ made His body into bread, yet this is the kind of making of which Tertullian speaks.

46. Be it observed that this was no private opinion of Tertullian. Other Fathers stated the same thing. Thus Cyprian, his disciple, says. 'For when the Lord calls His body bread, which is made up of the union of many grains, &c., and when He calls His blood wine, which is pressed from many clusters,' &c. (12 9.) In a commentary universally accepted as accredited patristic testimony, under the name of Jerome, we have the following, 'Jesus took bread and blessing, broke, transfiguring His own body into bread,' &c. (18 59.) The passage is cited with approval as from Jerome in the *Catena Aurea* of Aquinas and the Commentaries of Nicolas de Lyra. Ælfric, an English Archbishop, about the year 1000, in a discourse in answer to the Paschasian doctrine of the real presence, must have regarded the phrase, 'This bread is my body' as equivalent to the phrase, 'my body is this bread.' Apparently quoting a passage from Augustine, where he points out the sin of understanding such metaphors as 'lion,' 'lamb,' and 'rock,' when applied to Christ literally, Ælfric to these metaphors adds that of bread, and argues that the words body and blood are no more literally what they are called, than the other metaphors are. Thus he says, 'Christ is said to be bread by signification, and a lamb and a lion. . . . He is called bread because He is our life. . . . But Christ is not so, notwithstanding, after true nature; neither bread, nor a

‘lamb, nor a lion. Why is then the holy housel (sacrament) ‘called Christ’s body, or His blood, if it be not truly what it is ‘called?’ (27 4, 5). According to this reasoning, Christ’s body is no more literally sacramental bread, nor sacramental bread Christ’s body, than Christ was literally bread when He said, ‘I ‘am the bread of life.’

47. The proposition, ‘This is my body,’ logically considered, may mean, ‘my body is this bread,’ but whether or not, several of the Fathers so understand and interpret it, and the manner in which they apply the text in question from Jeremiah cannot admit of any other interpretation.

48. Origen applies the text to Christ, and interprets the word bread figuratively, after the same manner as he does the word body in the phrase, ‘This is my body.’ (Compare 11 46 with 13.)

49. Lactantius, after citing the text, remarks, ‘But the wood signifies ‘the cross, and the bread His body, because ‘He Himself is the food and life of men, who believe in the ‘flesh which He bore, and the cross on which He hung.’ (13 1.) This witness is equally against the Paschasians.

50. Ambrose, quoting the words, ‘Let us cast wood on ‘His bread,’ states, ‘He hath well said bread instead of His ‘flesh. . . . The Jews knew not what they were saying, and ‘they spoke a mystery . . . blessed word of the Lord which ‘hath crucified the sins of all, blessed flesh, which hath ministered a sacrifice for all!’ (*In Psalm xxxv.*, tom. i. col. 675.)

51. Cyril, in his Catechetical Lectures, speaking of the prophetical types of the cross, after quoting the words, ‘Come ‘now let us put wood upon His bread,’ observes, ‘and if the ‘Lord reckon thee worthy, thou shalt hereafter know, that ‘His body according to the gospel bore the type of bread.’ (*Cat.* xiii. c. 10 p. 76.) On the supposition that the bread was made into or became the body or flesh of Christ, as Romanists pretend, it would be absurd to say that it bore a type of that body or flesh.

52. Jerome says, ‘He who knew no sin was made sin for ‘us: and they said, Let us put wood upon His bread, ‘namely, the cross on the body of the Saviour. For it was ‘He Himself who said, “I am the bread which came down

“from heaven.” (18 27.) Theodoret says respecting the text, ‘The word of prophecy chiefly agrees with the Lord Christ. For He called His own body bread. For He said, “The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for “the life of the world.” They affixed this bread to the wood, ‘thinking that His memorial would be blotted out.’ (23 20.)

53. Rabanus Maurus informs us that ‘this is the consensus of all the churches, that under the person of Jeremiah ‘they understood that these things were said by Christ,’ and he instructs us that ‘the bread of Jesus, by which we are ‘nourished, may be interpreted His word.’ He appears to give the sentiments of Origen and Jerome. (26 6.)

54. From the uniform application made of this text, we have the strongest possible indirect proof that the Fathers were entirely ignorant of the Paschasian doctrine of the real presence. They not only do not teach the doctrine nor utter a syllable that can be fairly construed in its defence, which is unaccountable if they really believed it; but several of them speak so as to prove that such a doctrine must have been entirely unknown to them.

55. Not only do the Fathers give a mystical or spiritual interpretation to the word bread in the Old Testament, but also to the word bread in the New. One instance is deserving of special notice, as it has a most important bearing upon the present controversy. Some of the Fathers, more especially the Latin, interpret the words ‘daily bread’ of the Lord’s Prayer spiritually.

56. Tertullian is the first of these. ‘Although we may ‘understand spiritually “Give us this day our daily bread.” ‘For Christ is our bread, because Christ is life, and bread is ‘life, “I am,” saith He, “the bread of life,” and, a little ‘above, “The bread is the word of the living God, which ‘“cometh down from heaven.” Then again, because in the ‘bread is understood His body, “This is my body,”’ (10 2.) Here Tertullian is not speaking of the sacramental bread, but of Christ, the reality of the sacramental bread. He shows that in St John Christ calls Himself bread, and also represents Himself by that metaphor in the Eucharist, from which Tertullian infers that the phrase ‘daily bread’ in the Lord’s

Prayer, spiritually considered, denotes Christ Himself. The phrase 'in the bread, is understood His body,' is one of several phrases which he uses to express something signified or represented, but not really present. Thus he says, 'Whose body the prophet figured in bread.' (10 1.) 'Bread where-with He represents His own very body.' (10 8.) 'Christ gave to bread to be the figure of His body, whose body the prophet figured into bread.' (10 10.) 'He made His own body bread by saying "This is my body," that is, the figure of My body.' 'Why doth He call His body bread?' 'He hath plainly shown what He meant bread to signify calling His body bread.' (10 13.) "'Blessed are the meek." Under this word surely the impenitent cannot be understood.' 'What now if Christ be understood in Daniel by this very title 'of the Son of man.' (See ch. x. 31, 32 above.) Either all or none of these phrases teach Dr Pusey's doctrine, viz., that the sign can itself at the same time be the thing signified. Some do not teach His doctrine, therefore none do. According to Tertullian, Christ the Bread may be received apart from the sacrament. (10 6.) In immediate connection with the words under consideration, he remarks, 'Wherefore in praying for "daily bread," we pray to be perpetually in Christ, and undivided from His body.' (10 2.) This does not necessarily refer to a sacramental participation, but to the union between Christ and His people which is represented in the Eucharist. From the Master we pass to the disciple.

57. Cyprian, like him whom he called master, considered that the phrase "daily bread" may be understood both in the spiritual and simple meaning. (12 1.) In its spiritual meaning he understood it to be expressive of the believer's union with Christ. For he says, 'Christ is the bread of us who appertain to His body;' and he further adds, 'Whilst it is manifest that those do thus live [for-ever] who appertain to His body, and receive the Eucharist by right of communion.' (12 1.) Doubtless "by right of communion," he means, as the Fathers generally teach that, being one bread and one body in relation to Christ and to each other as believers, we fitly receive the Eucharist as especially denoting or representing this union, as Augustine and other Fathers plainly teach. (See secs. 80-

103 below.) It is certain that Cyprian, by "daily bread," did not necessarily mean sacramental bread any more than Tertullian did; but Christ Himself, who may be received both in, and apart from, the sacrament.

58. Cyril of Jerusalem distinguishes this bread from the visible sacramental bread, and in this particular, that it does not enter the natural mouth, but is diffused through all that the believer is, for the benefit of soul and body. (15 14.) Here it is plain that the sacramental bread does not in itself really contain Christ, who is figuratively called bread.

59. Some author, under the name of Ambrose, plainly teaches that the "daily bread" of the Lord's prayer, understood in relation to Christ, 'is not that bread which passes into the 'body, but the bread of eternal life, &c.' (17 16.) If it is true, as Dr Pusey and the Paschasians generally teach, that whoever receive the consecrated bread by the mouth receive Christ the life-giving bread after the same manner, this author must have been a heretic.

60. Jerome, our most learned witness, has given a critical exposition of the phrase "daily bread," but gives not the remotest hint of the sacramental bread of the Eucharist. He regards the words as applying to Christ, just as his own words did when He said, 'I am the living bread which came down 'from Heaven.' (18 29.) He, 'the righteous one, gives this 'bread to the hungry, of whom it was written, "Blessed are 'they that hunger and thirst after righteousness.'" (18 29.) Again, in his commentary on St Matthew's Gospel, in connection with a learned critique on the words 'daily bread,' he states nearly the same thing. 'When then we pray God 'to give us our peculiar or chief bread, we mean Him who 'says in the Gospel, "I am the living bread which came down "'from Heaven.'" (18 53.) He concludes thus, 'We can understand "supersubstantial bread" in another manner. He 'who is above all substances and surpasses all creatures.' (18 53.) This, doubtless, also applies personally to Christ. Here this very learned Father, with the preceding ones, speaks of our receiving, daily, Christ the living bread, without even an allusion to a sacramental participation.

61. Augustine is our next witness. He evidently was much

disposed to regard the phrase as relating to a sacramental participation of Christ; but as this was not the Catholic view, he did not insist upon it. He has given many comments on the words "daily bread;" some of these we shall notice in the order in which they stand in his writings. He says, 'It has 'been called "daily bread" either for all those things which 'sustain the necessities of life . . . or for the sacrament of 'the body of Christ . . . or for spiritual food, of which the 'same Lord says, "Labour not for the meat which is corrupted," and again, "I am the bread of life which came ' "down from heaven." Of these three that which is most 'probable can be considered.' (21 27.) After apparently relinquishing the application of the words to the sacramental bread, he remarks, 'It remains, therefore, that by "daily ' "bread" we understand spiritual bread, namely, the divine 'precepts which daily we ought to contemplate and practice.' He concludes thus, 'But if any one wishes to understand 'those things which concern the necessary food of the body, 'or that opinion concerning the sacrament of the Lord's body, 'it is necessary that all three be conjointly understood, that 'is to say, let us seek at the same time bread necessary for 'the body, and also the visible and invisible sacrament of the 'Word of God.' (21 27.) From this we learn with certainty that in the mind of Augustine that which he calls spiritual food and the invisible sacrament of the Word of God, can be as truly and really received apart from the sacrament as in it.

62. Elsewhere he speaks of the Eucharist as our daily food. and also 'the Word of God which in words is opened to us 'daily . . . is daily bread.' (21 113.) In another discourse he states, 'And the Word of God which is preached daily is 'bread. For because it is not bread for the stomach, it is 'not on that account not bread for the soul. But when this 'life shall have passed away, we shall neither seek that bread 'which hunger seeks, nor shall we have to receive the sacrament of the altar, because we shall be there with Christ, 'whose body we do now receive, nor will those words which 'we are now speaking, need to be said to you, nor the sacred 'volume to be read, when we shall see Him who is Himself 'the Word of God.' (21 118.)

63. In these two citations Augustine certainly teaches that the daily bread, that is, Christ Himself, can as well be received through the medium of the Holy Scriptures as through the sacraments. In the latter citation he makes a parallel between the sacrament of the Altar on the one hand, and the words of Scripture and the reading of the sacred volume, on the other. In the one case the sacramental signs will cease when we are with Christ; in the other, 'when we 'shall see Him who is Himself the Word of God,' we shall no longer need spoken or written signs. With Augustine, in the same sense in which the consecrated elements were the body and blood of Christ, the written or spoken signs of the sacred volume were Christ the Word of God. Dr Pusey, in the second extract, as may be seen, 21 118, has greatly imposed upon his readers by citing only what Augustine says respecting receiving Christ in the sacrament, and omitting to cite what he says respecting receiving Him in His words. Augustine further says: 'There is a daily bread, for which 'the children pray. That is the Word of God which is dealt 'out to us day by day . . . Our daily food, then, in this 'earth is the Word of God, which is dealt out always in the 'churches.' (21 125.)

64. Coming down several centuries, we find the venerable Bede, in his Commentary on St John, stating: 'Therefore 'bread, because of life; and therefore life, because it came 'down from heaven, Himself saying, "I am the way, the "truth and the life." This is that supersubstantial bread, 'which, that it may be given to us, we are commanded to 'pray daily. Since our Lord Jesus Christ said that He was 'the bread that came down from heaven.' (24 8.) Here we learn, as in the other instances, that there may be a real participation of Christ apart from the sacrament.

65. We come now to a distinguished disciple of Bede—Alcuin, who died A.D. 804. In his commentary on St John he repeats the above sentiments of Bede (*Opera*, col. 485.) In his treatise on Divine Offices, after enlarging upon the statements of Augustine, which we have already noticed, he concludes thus: 'By bread we can understand divine declarations, the knowledge of the Law and of the Prophets, of

‘the Psalms and the Gospel. “Give us this day our daily
 ‘“bread,” that is, in all time of our life recruit us by the
 ‘doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, because as by corporal food
 ‘the body is recruited, so with spiritual the soul is recruited
 ‘to the love and knowledge of Himself.’ (*Col.* 1121.)

66. Bertram, quite in accordance with the evidence we have adduced, gives the words ‘daily bread’ in connection with those instances in the sixth of St John, where Christ calls Himself bread as a figurative form of expression. Thus he says: ‘Figure is a certain outshadowing which
 ‘exhibiteth what it meaneth under some sort of veil; for instance, when we would speak of the Word, we say bread; as in the Lord’s Prayer, we pray that God would give us
 ‘our daily bread.’ (25 5.) Here Bertram appeals to the phrase ‘daily bread’ as a figure of speech for the definite purpose of proving, in answer to Paschasius, that the consecrated bread is not really the body of Christ, but only figuratively so. (See ch. ix. 64.)

67. Rabanus Maurus, an opponent of the doctrine of Paschasius, in the ninth century, repeats the sentiments of the early Fathers, more especially those of Augustine, (26 7, 8), which the reader may consult.

68. As the Fathers believed Christ to be present in the Scriptures, and that Himself, His flesh, or body, and His blood, can be as truly received by faith through the medium of the Scriptures as through the medium of the sacraments, we should naturally infer that as the written or spoken signs employed in the Scriptures to represent or signify Christ are not really Christ, but are so only significantly and representatively, so no more are the sacramental signs Christ, and are only so significantly and representatively. Or, again, that as the written or spoken signs of Scripture are not really the very words of God, they as sounds having passed away, but by a figure of speech are called the Word of God, so no more are the sacramental signs the body of Christ, although they are so called in Scripture, no more are they the Word of God, although so called by the Fathers. We are now prepared to show, from the express teaching of Augustine, that the sacramental signs of the Eucharist no

more are, or contain, the flesh, or body and blood, of Christ than do the signs, whether written or spoken, whether addressed to the eye or to the ear, which are employed in Scripture.

69. The citations which Dr Pusey has made from Augustine occupy about forty-four pages; and with regard to them, he says: 'I will prefix here one passage in which Augustine blends remarkably the significance of the sacrament and the doctrine of the real presence, and will then give passages on the real presence as they occur in the order of his works.' (*Notes, &c.* p. 498.) Of all the citations which Dr Pusey has made from Augustine, this one, in his judgment, stands pre-eminent in favour of the doctrine of the real presence, and is thus placed first and foremost, as if at the very onset he would so overwhelm his unlearned readers with demonstrative proof of Augustine's belief of the doctrine of the real presence as held by the disciples of Paschasius, that no subsequent citations, even though contradictory, should ever obliterate the impression. The citation in question is given, **21 18.** A part of this is now adduced. Augustine represents St Paul as 'preaching Christ by signifying Him at one time by his tongue, at another by letter, at another by the sacrament of His body and blood.' (**21 18.**) Here Augustine classes the sacrament, or, as defined by him, the sacred sign of Christ's body and blood, with other significant signs which were not, or did not really contain that of which they were the signs. It is true that of those signs which were not sacramental, Augustine remarks: 'Yet neither St Paul's tongue, nor parchment, nor ink, nor significant sounds uttered by the tongue, nor marks of letters upon skins, do we call the body of Christ.' (**21 18.**) Augustine here teaches, that although these unsacramental signs were not honoured with the same titles as the sacramental ones, yet they were equally significant of Christ. Dr Pusey does not appear to dispute this, for, as we have noticed above, he remarks, 'Augustine blends remarkably the significance of the sacrament and the doctrine of the real presence.' But on what grounds does Dr Pusey consider that Augustine believed the doctrine of the real presence with the sacramental sign, and not with the other signs? Simply because, he states, 'the other signs we

‘do not call the body of Christ ;’ and as the sacramental sign is called the body of Christ, Dr Pusey most unwarrantably claims this as one of the best proofs he can give from the voluminous writings of Augustine, that he believed the doctrine of the real presence as held by Paschasius and his disciples. We beg the reader carefully to consider the whole passage (21 18), for we feel persuaded he will conclude that if this is the best proof which Dr Pusey can give of his doctrine from Augustine, it would have been better entirely to have passed over such a witness. If a thing is to be really and absolutely what it is called, then most astounding acts of faith might be deduced from the Fathers, such as would eclipse even those of Dr Pusey, of which these pages contain some striking instances. A list of extracts from the Fathers is given in chapter xii., in which it will be seen that many things are called or named by other names of which it would be most outrageous to suppose that they really are what they are called or named. Here we shall only give one most legitimate instance from Augustine himself, and which has the approval of Dr Pusey. Augustine says, ‘Almost all call the sacrament ‘His body.’ (21 106), and Dr Pusey remarks, ‘True, but he ‘does not say that they call it so untruly.’ (35 50.) But if the sacrament was truly called the body of Christ would not any who did not call it the body of Christ be regarded as heretics by Augustine? Nothing of the kind. It would seem all did not call the sacrament the body of Christ, which evidently to Augustine was a matter of no importance. But of what body of Christ is Augustine here speaking, of the body which was born of Mary, and was crucified, or the body of Christ’s believing people? Doubtless of the latter, and not of the former, as the reader cannot fail to see by looking at the context. (21 106.) But Dr Pusey and the Paschasians generally do not believe that there is the real presence of Christ’s body of believing people in the consecrated elements, even though Augustine admits that almost all call the sacrament of them the body of Christ. The truth is, the sacrament, according to the plain teaching of Augustine, is not really Christ’s body in any proper sense, being neither His own body nor that of His people.

70. We cannot forbear noticing in passing how Canon Trevor misrepresents the teaching of Augustine in this very passage for no other reason, as far as we can see, than to claim the testimony of Augustine for the respectable but erroneous form of doctrine called High Anglicanism by making it appear that Augustine considered that sacramental signs had the force of truth annexed to them, whereas the writings of St Paul were bare signs having no such force of truth annexed to them. Thus he says, 'After mentioning a number of types 'which were bare signs, having no force of the truth annexed, 'Augustine continues, "We do not call these the body of " "Christ,"" &c. (*Sacrifice and Participation of the Holy Eucharist*, p. 214.) One of the things which Canon Trevor calls a type, and a bare sign, having no force of the truth annexed, is the oral and epistolary teaching of St Paul. Let the reader examine the whole passage of Augustine (21 18), and he cannot fail to see how unfairly the real teaching of Augustine has been treated, and apparently to support the very doubtful doctrine of High Anglicans.

71. In another part of this extract from Augustine, so important in Dr Pusey's estimation, we are told that 'God 'frameth things visible and tangible, as he willeth to signify 'and show Himself' (21 18.) But surely we are not to infer that God is actually in the things by which He is signified and shown, or that such things are really God any more than any other things are. For Dr Pusey and his school to build so much upon such casual terms as 'called,' 'signified,' 'shown,' 'represented,' &c., in relation to the body and blood of Christ, as if the Fathers by the use of such language implied their belief of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, is a worthless, if not a contemptible expedient. (See ch. xii.)

72. Augustine speaks of sacraments, that of the Lord's Supper being one of them, as 'very mighty in significance.' (21 6.) If in his opinion the sacrament really was what it signified, his manner of speaking of it is unaccountable. In his excellent treatise on Christian doctrine, he has laid down certain rules for determining what in Scripture should be taken literally and what figuratively, and has pointed out the

various kinds of signs employed in Scripture and their power of signification. He states, 'All teaching consists either of 'realities or signs.' He represents words as signs whose entire use is for signification, 'for no one uses words except 'for the sake of signifying something.' (21 8.) He states, 'A sign is a thing which, besides the form which it presents 'to the senses, causes something else external to itself to 'come into the mind.' (21 9.) He then says, 'Some signs 'pertain to the sense of sight,' which he illustrates, and adds, 'All these things are as it were visible words,' and he includes the sacrament of the Lord's Supper among these visible words which appeal to other senses than that of hearing. He says, 'For the Lord also . . . by the sacrament of His body and of His 'blood, being eaten beforehand, signified what He intended.' (21 10.) In another part of his writings, where, in answer to a Manichean, he had to prove that although sacraments relating to the sacrifice of Christ before His coming were different from those which related to His sacrifice after He had come, yet the things signified by the different sacraments were identically the same, and he shows that sacraments like words though different in form, may relate to the same thing. Thus referring to the sacrifice of Christ he says, "'About to be done," and "done," "about to suffer," and "'having suffered," can neither be extended equally nor 'sounded alike.' And then by way of showing the perfect identity of words and sacraments as significant, he remarks, 'For what else are all corporal sacraments, but as it were 'certain visible words.' (21 39, and also 38, 42.)

73. It is quite certain from the plain teaching of Augustine that sacramental signs are no more really the things which they signify than words are, whether written or spoken. In regard to the sacrament of baptism, he remarks, 'Take 'away the word, and what is the water but water. The word '[pronounced or uttered] is added to the element, and it 'becomes a sacrament, itself a visible word.' (21 101.) After illustrating this, and confirming it from Scripture, he concludes, 'The cleansing therefore would by no means be 'ascribed to the fluid unstable element, were there not added "'by the word.'" We have no reason to suppose that

Augustine would regard the elements of the Lord's Supper in in any way different from the element of baptism. In both cases the words which explained their significance were the more important, the elements being adjuncts to give visibility and impressiveness to words, at least this is what Augustine teaches. The word as a spoken sign appealed only to one of our senses, the sacrament as a sacred sign (21 1, 26, 28) appeals to more of our senses, but as a sign is no more what it signifies than the spoken word relating to the same thing, though, to use the language of Augustine, being 'very mighty' 'in significance' (21 6), 'most majestic in meaning' (21 12), it may be more impressive.

74. But to come back to the excellent treatise on Christian Doctrine, Augustine gives a very needful caution against understanding figurative language literally and among other things states, 'It is indeed a miserable slavery of the mind to 'take the signs for realities, and not be able to lift the eye of 'the mind above the corporeal creature to imbibe the eternal 'light.' (21 11.) He then forms a contrast between the Jewish and Christian dispensations, remarking,

'We are no longer laden with the burdensome operations of those 'signs whose meaning we now know; but the Lord himself and 'the apostolic discipline have handed down certain few signs instead 'of many, and those most easy to perform, most majestic in meaning, 'most pure in the observance, such as are the sacrament of Baptism, 'and the celebration of the body and blood of the Lord, which signs 'every man when he receiveth, being initiated, knoweth to what they 'should be referred, not to venerate them with a carnal servitude, but 'rather with a spiritual freedom. And as it is a mark of vile bondage 'to follow the letter and take the signs for the things signified by 'them,' &c. (21 12.)

75. Could anything be more fatal to the superstition of Paschasius, and all who follow him, than taking our Lord's words both in relation to the institution of His supper and His discourse at Capernaum respecting eating His flesh and drinking His blood, in a literal sense. In the former case, the signs are taken for the things signified, which is a direct violation of the plain teaching of Augustine; and, in regard to the latter, the offence is even still greater, for in this same treatise he goes on to say, 'If a form of speech is preceptive, 'forbidding either a disgraceful thing or a crime, or command-

'ing what is useful or beneficent, it is not figurative. But if 'it seems to command a disgraceful thing or a crime, or to 'forbid what is useful or beneficent, it is figurative, "except " ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye " have no life in you." He seems to command a disgraceful 'thing or crime, therefore it is figurative, commanding us to 'communicate in the passion of the Lord, and sweetly and 'profitably to treasure up in our memory that His flesh was 'crucified and wounded for us.' (21 13.) If sacraments really were what they signified, the distinct teaching of Augustine as here given, is utterly inexplicable.

76. He concludes this book of his treatise on Christian doctrine with the seven rules of Tychonius the Donatist, extracts from three of which are given in the Catena which will show how Augustine speaks of the body of true believers as being the real body of Christ. (21 15-17.) This excellent treatise of Augustine, the first attempt perhaps ever made at laying down definite principles of Biblical interpretation, is signally destructive of the doctrine of Paschasius and his followers; this may account for Dr Pusey's suppressing some of its strongest passages, notwithstanding his affirmation in regard to his fair dealing with patristic testimony. (35 41.)

77. Augustine definitely explains a mystery as being designed to *signify* something 'which is not to be taken according to its proper meaning, but in it is one thing to be understood from another.' (21 22.) Here a mystery is no more than which it signifies than a word is. In answer to an Arian when it was necessary for him to express himself advisedly and correctly, speaking of 'the water and the blood' (1 John v. 8) in relation to Christ, he says, 'For these are sacraments 'in which not what they are, but what they show is always 'attended to; since they are signs of realities, one thing in 'substance, another in signification.' (21 43.) Probably Augustine is here referring to the sacrament of Baptism and that of the Lord's Supper, and whether or not, he plainly teaches that sacraments are employed for the purpose of expressive signification, but are not that which they signify or represent. This may be seen from what follows, 'Does Christ 'die as often as the passover is celebrated? but yet the yearly

' memorial does, as it were, represent what occurred long since, ' and causes in us such emotions as if we saw the Lord hanging on the cross.' (21 45.) That Christ's words are in the mind of Augustine as effectual a medium of signification as are His sacraments, and that His flesh can be eaten in His words as well as in His sacraments, appears from what follows. (See 21 55, 56.)

78. In his commentary on the 104th Psalm, it is plainly implied that there were some in his day who were disposed to worship or render a superstitious regard to metaphors such as ' sun ' signifying Christ. In regard to such he says, ' Understand, know how to hold Scripture, so that thou mayest see ' one thing put before thine eyes, another hinted to thy ' heart.' (21 63.) But this explanation that he gives to the sacramental elements is substantially the same as that which we have already noticed. Different sacramental signs were employed to signify Christ before His coming from those which signified Him after His coming. Thus Augustine says, ' This bread from heaven the manna signified, this bread the ' altar [or sacramental bread] doth signify.' But those in either case who ate rightly received Christ as their spiritual food. (21 77.) Augustine speaks of the sound of the word of Christ, and shows that it came by the voice of the flesh, and also through writers and their writings. (21 88.) Christ the word then can be received in His writings as well as in His sacraments. The sound of the word is as effectual a significant as the sacrament of the word, the latter appealing to more of our senses and appointed for a distinct purpose, yet is no more really what it represents or signifies than is the former. Augustine manifestly classes sacraments or sacramental signs with verbal signs. Thus with him the sacraments of the Israelites in the wilderness, though different in their nature, yet as to what they signified, were identical with Christian sacraments; thus he says, ' The signs were diverse ' in the same way as words are diverse, for words change their ' sounds according to their times or tenses, and of course, ' words are nothing but signs; it is in virtue of their signifying something, that they are words; take from the word its ' signification, and it is an empty sound.' (21 94.) The

same things which he here calls signs, a little further on he calls sacraments, and thus says, 'See then the signs varied, while the faith is the same. There the rock was Christ, to us that is Christ which is placed on the altar of God. And they, as a great sacrament of the same Christ, drank water flowing from the rock: we drink the faithful know what. If thou lookest at the visible form the thing is another, if at the intelligible signification they drank the same spiritual drink.' (21 94.) Augustine most certainly classes sacraments with words as significant when he says, 'For not the syllables of the name of Christ profit ought, nor the sacraments of Christ, where men resist the faith of Christ.' (21 98.) He speaks of the transientness of the sacramental signs and of the permanency of that which is signified by them, exactly as he does of the transientness of the vocal signs of the Word of God and of the permanency of that which is signified by them. Of vocal signs he thus speaks, 'We are admonished to love God. What I have this moment said, syllables made the whole of it . . . in sounding they passed away; yet ought not that which I admonished you to pass away; because He whom I have admonished you to love doth not pass away; and when ye, admonished by transient sounds, shall be converted unto Him, neither shall ye pass away,' &c. (For more to the same effect, see section 12 above.) Of sacramental signs he speaks as follows: 'What thou seest [of the sacramental signs] passes away; but that which is signified is invisible, does not pass away, but remains. Lo it is received, it is eaten, it is consumed. Is the church of Christ consumed? Are the members of Christ consumed? Never.' (21 127.) With Augustine, sacraments in their nature as significant in no respect differ from words, and are no more than which they signify than words are.

79. Chrysostom has well spoken on this point, he asks, 'Wherein consists the virtue of the gospel? In the figures of the letters, or in the understanding of the sense?' and answers, 'If in the figures of the letters, thou dost well suspend it about thy neck, but if in the understanding of the sense, then it is better that they be placed in thy heart

'than hung about thy neck.' (22 12.) The sacrament of the Lord's Supper might be spoken of after the same manner, and in fact Chrysostom has so spoken of it, and the reader is especially requested to mark what he says. (22 18.) How in the face of such evidence as this, Dr Pusey and others can ascribe to Augustine, and other Fathers generally, a belief that the sacramental signs of the Eucharist were not only significant, but were really and actually that which they signify, it is difficult to conceive, and quite unaccountable.

80. One of the important indirect proofs that the Fathers did not hold the Pасhasian doctrine of the real presence is, that if their language is to be taken literally, they rather teach the real presence of Christ's body of believing people in the elements. It is certain Augustine and other Fathers speak in a more distinct and unqualified manner of the presence of the body of true believers than of the body of Christ. But they most explicitly teach the presence of both in union, that one is not present without the other, and that the reality of the sacrament is the whole body of Christ including all His true members. We shall now adduce a portion of the patristic testimony upon this point.

81. Origen states, 'When we drink He does not depart 'from us, but Himself drinks it with us, since He Himself is 'in each of us, for we cannot alone and without Him either 'eat of that Bread or drink of the fruit of that true Vine, nor 'do thou marvel, since He Himself is both the Bread, and He 'eats the Bread with us,' &c. (11 18 and 8.) All this is perfectly simple and plain, viewed in the light of Origen's general doctrine. He teaches that all men, whether of the former or present dispensation, had or have Christ the Word within them. (11 3, 52.) When the communicant rightly receives the consecrated bread, he receives the Word which he is, or the Bread which he is, and when he rightly receives the cup, he also receives the Word which he is, or the Life which he is. He receives what he is, and is what he receives, that is, if he receives rightly. And so also Augustine plainly taught. (21 136 ; 24 28.)

82. Cyprian shows that in the sacrament of the bread and of the cup, the believing people are as much therein, or rather

represented thereby, as the body and blood of Christ are. He says—

‘Water alone cannot represent the blood of Christ. . . . For that ‘waters signify peoples. . . . We see that in the water the people are ‘understood, but in the wine is shown the blood of Christ. But ‘when in the cup water is mingled with wine, His people are ‘united to Christ, and the multitude of believers are united and con- ‘joined with Him in whom they believe. Which union and con- ‘junction of water and wine is so mingled together in the cup of the ‘Lord, that that commixture cannot again be separated. Thus then, ‘in consecrating the cup of the Lord water alone cannot be offered, as ‘neither can wine alone. For if any should offer wine alone, this is ‘as though the blood of Christ were without us; but if there be ‘water alone, the people begin to be without Christ. But when both ‘are mingled, and by an infused union each is joined with the other, ‘then the spiritual and heavenly sacrament is perfected. Thus then ‘the cup of the Lord is not water alone, or wine alone, unless both ‘are mingled together, as also the body of the Lord cannot be flour ‘alone or water alone, unless both are mixed and joined together and ‘compacted into one cohering bread. In which sacrament also the ‘people are shown to be united, so that many grains collected and ‘ground and mingled together make one bread; so in Christ, who is ‘the heavenly bread, we may know that there is one body with which ‘our number is joined and united.’ (12 6, 7; see also 25 4, 5.)

Here most certainly Cyprian teaches most distinctly that Christ is not present in the sacrament without His members nor His members present without Him, but both conjointly.

83. Jerome states, ‘But the Lord Jesus Christ hath given ‘us the true bread Himself, guest and banquet: Himself, ‘eating with us, and He who is eaten. His blood we drink; ‘and without Him we cannot drink. . . . And Christ shall ‘drink His own blood with us in the kingdom of the Church.’ (18 21.) Here Jerome with Origen teaches that Christ is as much present with the devout communicant as He is present in the sacrament. The plain truth is that the presence in both instances is mystical and spiritual, and not real in regard to the body of Christ which was born of Mary. Dr Pusey could not pretend that that kind of presence was with the devout communicant in receiving the body of Christ, and no more ought he to conclude from the teaching of Origen and Jerome that the communicant receives in the consecrated elements that kind of presence.

84. Gaudentius says, ‘Then since bread must needs be

'made from many grains of wheat formed into dough by means of water, and completed by fire, reasonably is this taken as a figure of the body of Christ since we know that out of the whole multitude of the human race there is made one body.' (19 13.) Again, 'In like way the wine [is taken as a figure] of His blood gathered from many berries, that is, grapes of the vineyard which He had planted.' (19 14.) Doubtless Gaudentius here includes in the body of Christ all His members. If it should be said that he does not here say the bread is the body, meaning the members of Christ's body, but a figure of it. The answer is, he also affirms 'the effects of Christ's passion are proclaimed for the well-being of our common life in the figure of His body and blood.' (19 16.) Plainly with Gaudentius the consecrated bread, in whatever sense it is the body of Christ, in that sense it is the body of the believing people who are Christ's body.

85. Augustine, in an exposition of the Eucharist, states, 'The whole church expects to have their mortal bodies quickened by Christ's spirit which dwelleth in them, which has been shown beforehand in the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, for there is no body of Him of which He Himself is the Head except the Church.' (21 7.) 'The unity of this body is commended to us in our sacrifice. . . . "We being many, are one bread and one body."' (21 4.) So real in the mind of Augustine was the union of believers with Christ, that he speaks of them as being His body in reality, and yet of course he means spiritually and figuratively. (21 15-17.) He says, 'The flesh of Christ is the life of the faithful if they neglect not to be His body.' 'But he who differs from Christ, neither eateth His flesh nor drinketh His blood, although he may daily indiscriminately receive the sacrament of so great a thing.' (21 20, 21.) The sacrament of what thing? Of the flesh or of the body of Christ, which is the life of the faithful, or the body of true believers? Nothing can be more certain than that Augustine here teaches that Christ's body includes in it the body of true believers, and is only received by those who are really of that body, and that those who are not of that body receive the signs only, but not the things signified.

86. Augustine states, 'A visible sacrifice is a sacrament of 'an invisible sacrifice, that is a sacred sign.' (21 28.) He considers this sacrifice to include the body of Christ's believing people; for he says, 'Therefore every work which is done 'so that in holy fellowship we devote ourselves to God, is a 'true sacrifice.' (21 28.) 'Truly it cometh to pass that the 'whole redeemed city itself, that is, the congregation and 'society of saints is offered a universal sacrifice to God by 'the high priest.' (21 28.) 'This is the sacrifice of Christians, "We being many, are one body in Christ," which 'body also the church celebrates in the sacrament of the altar 'known to the faithful, wherein the same sacrament is shown 'that in that oblation which it offers, itself is offered." (21 28.) 'We know that we must offer a visible sacrifice on an altar 'to none but to Him, whose invisible sacrifice in our hearts 'we ourselves ought to be.' (21 29.) 'The Priest is Himself the Offerer: He Himself also the Oblation; the sacrament 'of which reality He desires to be the daily sacrifice of the 'church, which, since it is the body of Himself, the Head, it 'learns to offer itself through Him.' (21 30.) In all that relates to sacrifice, whether as respects what is visible or what is invisible of it, the body of true believers are as much a part of it as the body of Christ,—in fact they are one body, the union in the sacrament and in that of which the sacrament is the sign is so complete and indissoluble that, according to the undoubted teaching of Augustine, what in any respect can be affirmed of the one can also be affirmed of the other.

87. Augustine very fully realised in his own mind the true union of the believer with Christ, and loved to dwell upon a relation so exalted and so dear. In his mind, the Lord, as the man Christ Jesus, appeared to do nothing on His own behalf but all on ours. Or rather what He did on the cross and subsequently, He did in us and we did in Him. Thus he says, 'Being about to die from that which He had of ours, 'He was in a panic, not in Himself, but in us; since too He 'both said this, that His soul was sorrowful even unto death, 'and all we ourselves of course with Him. For without Him 'we are nothing; but in Him is Christ Himself and we.

'How? Because whole Christ is head and body.' (21 46.) The reader is requested to read Augustine's explanation of this (21 46-48), and if he is a devout Christian, it will greatly refresh his mind. From these views, which are those of the early church generally, it will be fully seen how Christ as Head is not alone in the sacrament of the Supper, but that the body of the believing people are there also. How very different a real, learned, and able Catholic speaks about 'whole Christ,' as compared with a pretender to the name, may be seen. (39 2, 9-11.) The closeness and extent of this union is shown as follows: 'For the bread is the Word 'of God' (meaning the Lord Jesus Christ in His revealed word), 'which never departs from the righteous man's mouth. 'For that righteous man, when tempted in the person of his 'Head, gave this very answer, For when the devil said to the 'Lord Himself while a hungered, "Command that these stones "be made bread, He answered, "Man doth not live on bread "alone, but on every word of God."' (21 50.) Of the marvellous incorporation of the faithful into the body of Christ, Augustine speaks very explicitly in a portion of his commentary on the 143d Psalm. He says, 'He willed to speak in 'us who deigned to die for us. He hath made us His members. Sometimes then He speaketh in the person of His 'members, sometimes in His own person, as our head . . . 'we have nought that we can say without Him.' Augustine having stated this and much more, exhorts his hearers thus, 'Remember this, and commit to your memory, and keep it 'entirely fixed there, as children of the church's training and 'of the Catholic faith, that ye may perceive Christ to be the 'head and body.' That the reader may have some conception how fully Augustine realized this union, and the exalted and interesting manner in which he spoke of it, he will do well to consult (21 67), where he will find the above extracts in connection with their context.

88. Passing from the Psalms to his discourses on the Gospel of St John, the reader, if a devout believer in Christ, may refresh his soul by additional aspects, under which the ineffable union of Christ and His members is represented. (21 68.) Again, this marvellous incorporation into Christ is

shown to be by faith. He says: 'For to believe on Him, 'this is to eat the living bread. He that believeth, eateth.' (21 72.) But this eating Christ, or coming to Him by faith, which means the same thing, is incorporation into Him. Thus Augustine says: 'Whoso cometh to me is incorporated 'with me. . . . Let us come to Him, let us enter in unto 'Him, let us be incorporated into Him, &c.' (21 70.) The union of Christ and believers is illustrated by the union of soul and body; and as the body lives by the soul, so the body of believers lives by Christ; and this union is especially represented or signified in the consecrated bread; hence Augustine exclaims, 'O sacrament of piety, O sign of unity!' (21 79, 80). He further says: 'By this meat and drink, then, He would 'have to be understood the fellowship of His body and 'members, which is the Holy Church in His saints and 'faithful ones.' 'The sacrament of this thing—that is, of 'the unity of the body and blood of Christ . . . is taken, 'by some to life, by some to destruction; but the reality 'itself, of which it is the sacrament, is for every man to life, 'for none to destruction, whoever shall be a partaker thereof.' (21 82.)

89. This part of Augustine's writings demands more than a passing notice. From this mere fraction of his teaching respecting the believer's union with Christ, we cannot but see that of all the exalted themes on which his large soul loved to dwell, this incorporation into Christ must have had the first place in his affections. In his teaching on this ineffable mystery we have very prominently brought before our notice, the sacrament of the Eucharist, and that of which it is the sacrament, namely, its reality. The doctrine of Paschasius and his followers, Dr Pusey not excepted, is, that the reality is the real body of Christ which was born of Mary, and was crucified, and that whoever receive the duly consecrated bread, receive that reality also together with Christ's soul and Divinity. How directly contradictory this is to the most certain teaching of Augustine cannot fail to be seen by the candid reader. With him the sacrament or sign is not of Christ's real body which was born of Mary—that is, not its reality, but the sacrament or sign is of the believer's

union and incorporation with Christ ; and that is its reality. Augustine believed that Christ 'would have to be understood, the fellowship of His body and members,' not the real body of Christ which was born of Mary, as these Paschasians pretend. With Augustine the sacrament only of the unity of the body and blood of Christ could be taken to destruction ; with Dr Pusey and his school its reality also may be taken to destruction. With Augustine the reality of the sacrament 'is for every man to life, whoever shall be a 'partaker thereof ;' with Dr Pusey, and Roman Catholics generally, that which they take to be the reality of the sacrament is not taken by every man to life, but only by some. With Augustine the reality is not taken by any one to destruction ; according to the plain teaching of Dr Pusey and his fellow Paschasians, the reality is taken by some to destruction.

90. If the Fathers dwelt upon one Christian truth more than another, and loved to dwell thereon, as their warmth of expression and outflowing of soul testify, that Christian truth was the believer's union with Christ and incorporation into Him ; and that beyond all question with the Fathers, but especially with Augustine and Chrysostom was the reality alike of the sacrament of Baptism and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The evidence which we have further to adduce will yet more fully confirm this statement.

91. Augustine, in his Exposition of the sixth of St John, expresses himself thus 'this meat and drink, that is, the 'very fellowship of the saints, which maketh them by whom 'it is taken to be immortal and incorruptible, where shall be 'peace and unity, full and perfect. For to this end (as also 'men of God [Cyprian for one.—See sec. 82 above] who 'were before us have understood this matter) did our Lord 'Jesus Christ commend His body and blood in those things 'which are, out of many, reduced into some one. For out of 'many grains are several made into one thing, that is bread, 'and several do out of many berries flow into one thing, that 'is wine,' (21 83.) Here, again, we are taught, as Cyprian taught, that the body of believers, as much as the body of Christ, is the reality, of which the consecrated elements are

the significant signs ; for, in truth, they represent both in one. Speaking of our ‘ participation of the Son through the unity ‘ of His body and blood,’ he remarks, ‘ which thing that eating and drinking doth signify.’ (21 85.)

92. Augustine, in an especial discourse on the body and blood of the Lord, also founded on the sixth of St John, speaking concerning that body which the Lord said that He gave to be eaten for eternal life, remarks : ‘ But he expounds ‘ the manner of this bestowal and of His gift, how He would ‘ give men His flesh to eat, when He said, “ He that eateth ‘ “ my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in ‘ “ him.”’ The gift, of course, is Christ Himself, and the manner of the bestowal is mutual indwelling or union between Himself and the recipient ; and Augustine instructs us that the words, ‘ He that eateth my flesh and drinketh ‘ my blood,’ are not to be taken literally, but mystically, for he states, ‘ This, then, it is, that He hath taught and ‘ admonished us in mystical words, that we be in His body, ‘ under Himself the Head in His members, eating His flesh, ‘ not forsaking the unity of Him.’ (21 86.) He repeats the like sentiments in the same discourse : ‘ What the Lord ‘ hath given us to understand in the eating of His flesh and ‘ drinking of His blood, is that we should dwell in Him and ‘ He in us ; now we dwell in Him when we are members, ‘ and He dwelleth in us when we are His temple.’ (21 89.) No one, then, really eats Christ’s flesh in the sense intended, but His members. Toward the close of this discourse on the Lord’s body, he remarks, ‘ All this that the Lord spake concerning His flesh and blood, and how, in the grace of that ‘ distribution, He promised unto us eternal life, and how He ‘ would have us to understand who are they that eat His ‘ flesh and drink His blood, by this, namely, that they dwell ‘ in Him, and He in them.’ (21 90.) Here, again, he still confirms what he had taught before, that the phraseology relating to eating Christ’s flesh and drinking His blood is not to be taken literally, but, as he says, spiritually and mystically, as pertaining to the union of Christ’s members with Himself. It is certain, then, that in the mind of Augustine the members

of Christ are as much the realities of the sacramental signs in the Eucharist as Christ Himself is.

93. The union of Christ and His church is so complete, in the estimation of Augustine, that Christ Himself preaches Christ when His Church preaches Him; and that 'as he is 'in us here, so we also are in Him there;' and he says, 'Almost all, indeed, call the sacrament His body,' meaning His body of believers (21 106.); and Dr Pusey says, 'True, 'but he does not say that they call it so untruly.' (35 50.) Dr Pusey not only seems to admit that almost all called the sacrament His body, at least including His body of believing people, but that it was called so truly. But probably he understands Augustine to refer to the real body of Christ, which was born of Mary, and not in any wise to the mystical body of Christ.

94. The indissoluble union between Christ and believers, and the nature of that union in regard to the Lord's Supper as conceived of by Augustine, he has very distinctly explained to us in a discourse on the three modes in which Christ is revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures. How he speaks on this subject may be seen 21 114-116. Thus he says, 'our Lord 'Jesus Christ is named in three ways: When He is proclaimed 'either by the Law and the Prophets, or by the apostolical 'epistles, or by the faith of things done.' The last mode is that with which we are concerned. Of this he says, 'The third 'way is, He is in a certain manner the entire Christ, in the 'fulness of the church, that is, Head and body, according to 'the fulness of a certain perfect man in which man we are all 'members.' (21 114.) Dwelling still more fully upon this point, he shows that Christ received in this manner cannot be without His body, the believing people, as Christ and His people are really one. (21 115.) After illustrating this union as he has done in other places he then cites the words, 'They 'two are one flesh,' and remarks, 'See ye that he himself explains that we do not seem to dare to say anything of our 'own conjectures. For said he, "The two are one flesh," and 'he added, "This is a great sacrament, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church." According to this, then, from 'what has been said, the Church also is understood in Christ.

‘The two are in one flesh, there is not now two, but one flesh. And in the same manner, Bridegroom and bride, so Head and body. . . . Whether, therefore, I say, Head and body, or I say Bridegroom and bride, understand ye one.’ (21 116.) Let the reader well consider the whole of what is cited from Augustine in 21 114-116, and he will see that of the three ways in which Christ is named in the Scriptures, that is, by the Law and the Prophets, the apostolical epistles, and the faith of things done which we know in the Gospel, it is the last and not the first two, with which we are more especially concerned in this controversy; and that this last way of naming Christ includes all that is sacramental respecting Him. The two gospel sacraments visibly represent the union between Christ and his people, and if rightly received, represent a real and actual union with Him. This third way of naming Christ, according to Augustine, connects Him with his people, and we learn from it that He could not in this aspect be considered as separate from His people, inasmuch as He and they are considered to be one as man and wife are one flesh; as Bridegroom and bride are one; and as Head and body are one. The Eucharistic symbols therefore which are admitted by all in some way or other to represent this union, must as much represent the people of Christ as himself; his body or members as Him their head; and we conclude from the plain teaching and direct statements of Augustine on the subject, that the body of Christ or his members are as much present or represented in the consecrated elements as He their head is, that in whatever sense He the head is present or represented in the elements, there also are present or represented in the same sense his members.

95. Augustine in an especial address to the newly baptized on the Lord’s Supper says, ‘If ye have well received, ye are what ye have received, for the apostle says, “We being many are one bread.” He commends in a certain manner to you in that bread to love unity. For is that bread made of one grain? Were there not many grains of wheat? But before they came to be bread they were separated.’ (21 126.) He then goes on to show how the communicants were made bread and the body of Christ before their approach to the

Lord's table, and concludes thus, 'And ye were made bread, 'which is the body of Christ, and therefore unity is signified 'in a certain manner.' (21 126.) Towards the close of the address, he remarks, 'What thou seest [of the consecrated 'elements] passes away ; but that which is signified is invisible, 'does not pass away, but remains. Lo it is received, it is 'eaten, it is consumed. Is the Church of Christ consumed ? 'Are the members of Christ consumed ? Never.' (21 127.) Here Augustine is rather speaking of the body or members of Christ as represented in the consecrated elements than of their Head. Elsewhere he speaks in a similar strain of their Head. Thus he says, 'When we eat we do not make Him into parts, 'indeed it is so done in the sacrament and the faithful know 'how they eat the flesh of Christ.' . . . 'In parts He is eaten, 'and He the whole remaineth entire. By parts He is eaten 'in the sacrament, and He the whole remaineth entire in heaven. He the whole remaineth entire in thy heart.' (21 139.)

96. The latter passage is cited by Dr Pusey and as translated by him is calculated to impose upon the reader. (21 139.) But this passage fairly given, no more teaches the real presence of the body of Christ which was born of Mary, than the other passage teaches the presence of the real natural bodies of all the members of the true Church. In the one case, what is seen and employed sacramentally for the purpose of signification, is eaten, is consumed, but that which it represents or signifies which is the Church of Christ is not consumed. In the other case, that which is seen and is also employed as in the former case is made into parts and is eaten, but that which it signifies remains entire. We are not to conclude that Augustine affirms of one and the same thing and in the same sense, that it passes away, and it does not pass away, is consumed and is never consumed, and is made into parts and the whole remaineth entire. We are well instructed in various parts of his writings that sacraments or signs take the names of the things which they signify. The consecrated bread then entitled the body of Christ would pass away, be consumed, be made into parts, but that which it signified would not pass away, but would remain, would never be consumed, and the whole would remain entire. Here beyond

all question the consecrated bread in the opinion of Augustine stood exactly in the same relation to Christ as to His people, to the Head as to the members, and he speaks in the same style of one as he does of the other, from which we are certain if the real bodies of Christ's people are not in the consecrated elements, then no more is the real body of Christ in them.

97. In a distinct explanation of the Lord's Supper to young people, Augustine addressed them thus: 'If then you wish to understand the body of Christ, hear the apostle saying to the faithful, "Ye are the body of Christ and His members." If then ye are the body of Christ and His members, the mystery of yourselves is placed upon the Lord's Table.' (21 136.) Again, as on a former occasion, (21 126) speaking of the communicants as being made bread and the body of Christ, he says, 'Be what ye see, and take what ye are.' (21 136.) In another kindred discourse recorded by Bede, he again speaks of believers as being made the Lord's bread, and addresses them thus: 'You have, as it were, come to the cup of the Lord, and there ye are on the table, and there ye are in the cup.' (24 28.) As a matter of simple certainty, Augustine teaches that the reality of the thing signified in the consecrated elements is as much and in the same sense Christ's body of believing people as His own body, and if His proper body is really present in the elements, so are their proper bodies present also; if their proper bodies are not present, so no more is His.

98. Chrysostom in his own style represents the union between Christ and His body of believers not less strongly than Augustine. He shows that in the sacrament of the Supper believers are not only communicants but are also that of which they communicate; they are the bread of which they partake; 'they are that self-same body' which they sacramentally and spiritually eat. (22 20, 21.) In perfect accordance with this idea he represents the body of true believers as being as truly the body of Christ as that body of which Christ said, 'This is my body.' Thus he says, 'Wouldest thou do honour to Christ's body?—neglect Him not when naked; do not, while here thou honourest Him with silken garments, neglect Him perishing without of cold and nakedness. For

'He that said, "This is my body," and by His word confirmed the fact, this same said, "Ye saw me a hungered, and fed "me not," and "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the "least of these, ye did it not to me." For this indeed needs not coverings, but a pure soul; but that requires much attention. . . . Dost thou make Him a cup of gold, while thou 'givest Him not a cup of cold water? &c.' (22 5.) Referring to the same topic elsewhere he says, 'For though that which 'appears is not Christ, yet in this man's form Christ Himself 'receiveth and beggeth.' (22 10.) According to Chrysostom there is only the mystery of Christ's body, and not the true body in the consecrated elements, but Christ himself has a habitation in the hearts of believers. (22 11.) He no less than Augustine founds upon our Lord's teaching, as recorded in the sixth of St John, the mysterious union between Christ and believers. This will be seen on reference to 22 13, which the reader must see. Here Chrysostom, with Augustine, interprets the eating of Christ and drinking of His blood not literally, but as signifying our marvellous incorporation into Him, and that not necessarily in the sacrament of the Supper, for in that Holy Ordinance this incorporation is rather signified and commemorated than effected. That which Chrysostom calls the marvel or wonder of the mysteries, namely, our incorporation into Christ is as much connected with the mystery or sacrament of Baptism as it is with the mystery or sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and hence it is called the marvel of the *mysteries*. In this case the marvel or thing signified of the mysteries is not the real presence of Christ's body and blood, but the representation of our spiritual and mystical union with Him which is effected by believing in Him, confirmed and ratified in Baptism, commemorated and strengthened in the Lord's Supper.

99. How distinctly Chrysostom considered the sacramental elements to represent Christ's body of believers may be seen from what follows :—

'This altar [meaning the merciful man's] is composed of the very members of Christ, and the body of the Lord is made thine altar. That then revere: on the flesh of the Lord thou sacrificest the victim. For this altar [meaning the communion table] is admirable,

‘because of the sacrifice that is laid upon it; but that, the merciful man’s not only on this account, but also because it is even composed of the very sacrifice, which maketh the other to be admired. Again this is but a stone by nature; but become holy, because it receiveth Christ’s body; but that is holy, because it is itself Christ’s body. . . . But thou honourest indeed this altar, because it receiveth Christ’s body; but him that is himself the body of Christ, thou treatest with contumely, and when perishing neglectest.’ (22 26.)

Here we learn with certainty that in the mind of Chrysostom the consecrated elements were no more really the flesh or body of Christ than His believing people were His flesh or His body. We are not to blame Chrysostom for speaking of the consecrated elements as being the body or flesh of Christ in the same sense in which the believing poor were His body or flesh, for it was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and he doubtlessly believed that he was following the teaching of Holy Scripture, for he says, ‘The Scripture is wont to give the name of flesh to the mysteries of the Eucharist, and to the whole Church, calling them the body of Christ.’ (22 27.) If in the mind of Chrysostom the mysteries were really the flesh or body of Christ, is it credible that he could have uttered the above statements? We learn with certainty from these sentiments of Chrysostom that in his judgment in the same sense in which the sacramental symbols or mysteries were the body of Christ, they were the body of His believing people.

100. Perhaps of all the instances in which Chrysostom speaks of the marvellous union between Christ and His people, that, in a discourse on the Lord’s body, is most eloquent and, at the same time, telling and trustworthy. (22 28, 29.) Here he shows that there is the same connection between the body of Christ’s believing people and Him their Head as there is between the natural head and body. Thus he says: ‘Look again, whither he hath raised the church! . . . He hath raised it up to a vast height, and set it on yonder throne; for where the Head is, there is the body also. There is no interval to separate between the head and the body; for were there a separation, then were the one no longer a body, then were the other no longer a head. (22 28.) Let us feel awed at the closeness

‘of our relation, let us dread lest any one should be cut off ‘from this body, &c.’ (22 28.) After speaking in this manner of Christ’s body, the church, he goes on to speak of Christ’s body which was crucified. (22 29.) But with Chrysostom, as with the Fathers generally, Christ is so identified with His body of believing people, that all which He has done, and all which He has promised to do, is as if they had done it. Thus, according to Chrysostom, they died, rose, ascended, and sit with Christ, their Head; and this union is especially signified in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper and the realities of the sacrament are as much the body of Christ’s redeemed and believing people as they are the body of Christ Himself; and so, manifestly, teaches Chrysostom. He well concludes the discourse thus: “‘For as often,” saith he, “as ‘ye do this, ye do show the Lord’s death,” *i.e.*, ye do a ‘remembrance of the salvation that has been wrought for you, ‘and of the benefits which I have bestowed.’ (22 29.)

101. On the text, ‘For we are members of his body, of ‘his flesh, and of his bones,’ Chrysostom recurs to the ineffable union between Christ and His members. (22 30.) We have often had occasion to notice that, according to the teaching of the Fathers, before coming to the Lord’s Table rightly, communicants must be incorporated into the body of Christ. Thus Chrysostom, alluding to the Marcionite heretics, says, ‘That which is born of water, whatever it is that is born, ‘that they confess to be a true birth; but that we are made ‘His body, that they admit not. And yet if we do not become so, how will the expression “of his flesh and of His bones” suit? . . . As, then, the Son of God is of our nature, so are we of His substance; and as He hath us in Himself, so also have we Him in us.’ (22 30.) The true believer being of the body of Christ before coming to His table, and such being the closeness of the union, we at once see why the Fathers as much regard the consecrated elements as signifying the members of Christ, as signifying Christ Himself.

102. On the words, ‘We are made partakers of Christ,’ he says: ‘By partaking of Him, he means that we and He ‘are become one; since He is the Head, and we the body, ‘fellow-heirs and of the same body. “We are one body, of

“His flesh,” saith the apostle, “and of his bones.” “If we
 “hold fast the beginning of our subsistence steadfast unto
 “the end.” What means “the beginning of our subsistence?”
 ‘He speaks of faith by which we subsist, and were born,
 ‘and, so to speak, were made of one body with Him.’
 (22 32.) How are we to reconcile this with his statement
 above, that this union was effected in Baptism? Doubtless,
 what is here recorded by Chrysostom is antecedent to true
 Baptism, or the right receiving of that holy ordinance; and
 when thus received, or presuming that it is so received, it
 is common in Holy Scripture and with the Fathers to speak of
 signs or seals as if they were the instrumental cause of that
 of which they are the signs or seals. (See ch. iii. 95, 96.)

103. So close is the union of Christ and His body, the
 church, in the opinion of Theodoret, and so strikingly is it
 displayed in the Lord’s Supper, that he thus represents it:
 ‘Not offering aught Himself, but the Head of them who offer.
 ‘For He calls the church His body, and through it, as man,
 ‘He exercises the priest’s office; but as God, He receiveth
 ‘the offerings. But the church offereth the symbols of His
 ‘body and blood, hallowing the whole lump through the first
 ‘fruits.’ (23 14.) Theodoret plainly teaches, that in Baptism
 we are incorporated into Christ, and become members of His
 body, of His flesh, and of His bones. (23 31.)

104. Another portion of indirect evidence that the Fathers
 did not believe the real presence of Christ’s body and blood
 in the consecrated elements, is, that the words body and
 blood, in relation to Christ, are often ranked with metaphorical
 phrases which could not possibly be understood literally. Thus
 Clement of Alexandria associates the phrase ‘My blood is
 ‘drink indeed,’ and eating Christ’s flesh with undoubted meta-
 phorical phrases, which could not possibly be taken literally.
 (9 2, 4, 5.) Origen shows that the Word of God [a title which
 he indiscriminately applies to Christ and the Holy Scriptures]
 is to some, water; to some, wine; to some, ‘blood, on account of
 ‘that “Except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you.”’
 In the mind of Origen, Christ or Holy Scripture, is no more
 really blood than it is really water or wine, (11 1.) Again:
 ‘Nor do thou marvel because the Word of God [meaning

‘either Christ personally or the word from Him] is also called ‘flesh and bread, and is called milk, and is called herbs, and ‘for the capacity of believers, or the possibility of receiving ‘Him, He is diversely named.’ (11 21, and also sec. 18.) Origen, speaking of the sacramental cup, which, after the manner of Scripture, he calls the fruit of the vine, asks, ‘Of ‘what vine?’ and answers, ‘Surely of that of which He Himself was the figure, saying, ‘I am the vine, ye are the “branches.”’ Whence, again, he says, “My blood is drink “indeed, and my flesh is meat indeed.”’ (11 27.) Again, he represents the eating of the flesh of the Word of God, and drinking His blood, as participating of the fruit of the vine that is, the blood of the grape of the vine and its branches, by which he cannot mean any literal participation of blood. Nay, he plainly says, ‘The fruit of these branches, is deservedly ‘called the blood of those who are wounded, which we drink ‘from their words and doctrine.’ (11 36.)

105. Cyprian says, ‘The cup which is offered in remembrance of Him, should be offered mixed with wine. For ‘whereas Christ says, “I am the true vine,” the blood of ‘Christ is not surely water, but wine.’ (12 2.) He does not intend to blaspheme, as Augustine would consider it (21 122), by wishing us to understand that the wine was His blood in any proper sense. No more are we to understand that the wine was His blood in any proper sense.

106. Cyril speaks as distinctly of the Saviour becoming or being made a vine or a door, mediating highpriest, a sheep, and ‘all things to all remaining in His own nature what He is’ (15 5), as he does of the bread being made or becoming by consecration the body of Christ, and the wine His blood. (15 7.)

107. Ambrose speaks of believers being fed with the body and blood of Christ after the same manner as their being fed with milk, and states, ‘The five loaves are, as it were, milk; ‘but the more solid food is the body of Christ, the stronger ‘drink is the blood of the Lord.’ (17 10.)

108. Gaudentius says, ‘Since what you receive is the body of ‘that heavenly Bread, and the blood of that sacred Vine.’ (19 8.)

109. Chrysostom gives a long list of metaphorical words relating to Christ, such as Vine, Way, Shepherd, Lamb, Cloth-

ing. No one could pretend that Christ was really any one of these things. But Chrysostom ranks among these metaphors the flesh and blood of Christ. Thus he says, 'Dost thou wish to eat? He is made to thee a Table. Dost thou wish to drink? He is made to thee a cup, "He that eateth my " flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him."' (22 3.) This is but a mere specimen of the manner in which they speak of the flesh and blood of Christ metaphorically. If they understood those words in connection with the Eucharist literally as Paschasius did, and his disciples now do, how could they treat those words as metaphors by commonly connecting them with words that can be understood in no other sense?

110. The mode in which the Fathers represent the spiritual eating of the Christian Passover is utterly fatal to the Paschasian notion of really eating Christ's flesh and blood in the consecrated elements. Origen explains the eating of the flesh of the Lamb in the Christian Passover, not as really eating the flesh of Christ, but in various degrees according to the capacity of the recipient receiving the truth of Scripture respecting the Lamb, and remarks, 'We must come to the entire "Scripture as to one body." (11 2.) Again, commenting on the Jewish Passover which our Lord celebrated, and the Christian Passover by which it was replaced, not the remotest hint is given of actually and really eating the flesh of Christ in the manner taught by Dr Pusey and the Paschasian school. So far from supposing that the presence of Christ is on a table of wood or stone, and must be received from thence if received at all, according to Dr Pusey, Origen is by anticipation of the school of Calvin (35 10), and like him (30 5, 6, 16), rather speaks of our ascending to be with Christ than His descending to be with us. (11 8, 9, 17, 37, 47.) Jerome expressly says, 'Let us go up with the Lord into the large upper room ' . . . and let us receive from Him on high the cup of the ' New Testament, and keeping there with Him the Passover,' &c. (18 20.)

111. Gaudentius in a series of discourses explanatory of the Lord's Supper to the newly baptized, taking as the foundation of his discourses the institution of the Jewish passover, and regarding the passover lamb as representing Christ,

proceeds to show how Christ the lamb is to be eaten. Instead of teaching, like Paschasius and his eminent disciple Dr Pusey, a literal participation by the mouth of the flesh and blood of Christ the Lamb, he speaks of cordially receiving and firmly believing all that Christ has taught both in the Old and New Testaments. In showing in what manner the Lamb ought to be eaten, he explains the Lamb as 'the whole body of the Divine Scriptures. Thus he says, 'The whole body of the Divine Scriptures,' as well of the Old as of the New Testament, contains the Son of God; either promising that 'He will come unto man, or declaring that He has now 'come.' (19 5.) Then he goes on to show how he spoke by the Prophets of the Old Testament, and by the Evangelists and Apostles of the New Testament. (19 5. See also secs. 6 and 9.) He then proceeds to speak of the mysteries of the Lord's Supper, and distinctly states, 'What we have above explained generally, as to eating the flesh of the Lamb, we 'must observe especially in tasting these same mysteries of 'the Lord's passion.' (19 8.) On referring to the passage and its context, it may be seen how unfairly Dr Pusey has treated the testimony of this witness by giving one part of the truth and suppressing the other, which is calculated to deceive the reader. Dr Pusey by substituting 'already' for the word 'above' (*supra*), and suppressing the general explanation of eating the flesh of the Lamb, makes Gaudentius appear as a witness in favour of his doctrine. Now, had he given the whole truth, Gaudentius would have been a witness not for, but exactly against him. Speaking somewhat reservedly respecting the mysteries, as was common in public discourses in those days, he states, 'We must observe especially in tasting 'the same mysteries of the Lord's passion, what we have 'above explained generally as to eating the flesh of the Lamb.' He states at the beginning of the discourse the various things which he says he would 'begin from this day forward to explain.' (19 2.) The first thing he explains is the eating of the Lamb. How that was to be eaten we have seen, and we are taught especially to observe that the same mysteries of the Lord's passion must be eaten or tasted after the same manner. Nothing could be more fatal to Dr Pusey's doctrine of the real presence.

CHAPTER XII.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION BY ROMAN CATHOLICS CONSIDERED AND PROVED TO BE ALIKE CONTRARY TO HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS. THE TRUE INTERPRETATION VINDICATED FROM THE SAME SOURCES OF PROOF. THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION AS HELD BY THE GREEK CHURCH AND ACCEPTED BY DR PUSEY, SHOWN TO BE THE SAME AS THE ROMAN. THE FOLLY OF DR PUSEY'S BELIEF THAT MILLENARIAN FATHERS HELD THAT THE MIRACULOUS ABUNDANCE OF WINE IN THEIR SUPPOSED MILLENIUM WAS FOR THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST EXHIBITED. FULL EXAMPLES GIVEN FROM THE FATHERS OF THE MANNER IN WHICH THEY SPEAK OF THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS AS BEING CALLED, NAMED, ENTITLED, FIGURATIVELY TERMED, UNDERSTOOD TO BE, OR MADE THE IMAGE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST; OR, AS FIGURATIVELY REPRESENTING, SHOWING, MAKING TO APPEAR, OR BECOMING, &c. &c. CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD, AND THEIR BELIEF OF THE PASCHASIAN DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE PROVED TO BE INADMISSIBLE WITH SUCH A MANNER OF SPEAKING. THE FATHERS AND OTHERS VINDICATED FROM THE CHARGE OF EMPLOYING A SOPHISM WHEN THEY USE THE PHRASE, 'I AM THE TRUE VINE,' IN ILLUSTRATION OF THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION. FULL EVIDENCE GIVEN FROM THE FATHERS AS TO WHAT CONSTITUTED THE CONSECRATION OF THE SACRAMENTAL ELEMENTS, THE ACT SHOWN NOT TO CONSIST IN MERELY PRONOUNCING THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION, AND THAT CHRIST IS NOT THE CONSECRATOR OTHERWISE THAN THAT THE ACT HAS HIS SANCTION AND AUTHORITY. THE TESTIMONY OF THE MOST ANCIENT RITUALS EXAMINED AND PROVED TO BE AGAINST THE PASCHASIAN DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE. THE ACT OF CONSECRATION SHOWN TO BE COMMON TO ALL THE COMMUNICANTS, AND THE BISHOP OR PRESBYTER TO HAVE NO MORE INHERENT RIGHT OR POWER OF CONSECRATION THAN ANY OF HIS FELLOW COMMUNICANTS. THE FATHERS, WHERE THEY MORE DISTINCTLY EXPLAIN TO THE COMMUNICANTS THE NATURE AND EFFECTS OF CONSECRATION, SPECIALLY EXAMINED AND SHOWN TO BE AGAINST THE MODERN DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE, AS ALSO THEIR EXPOSITION AND APPLICATION OF THE 'SURSUM CORDA.' THE MANNER IN WHICH SOME OF THE FATHERS HAVE EXPLAINED THE PHRASEOLOGY OF THE EUCHARIST IN ANSWER TO THE APOLLINARIAN AND EUTYCHIAN HERETICS SHOWN TO BE FATAL TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE, AND ESPECIALLY TO THE TRANSUBSTANTIATION FORM OF IT. A FULL EXAMINATION OF THE FATHERS IN RELATION TO SACRIFICING, AND ESPECIALLY IN CONNECTION WITH THE LORD'S SUPPER AND THE MODERN DOCTRINE OF THERE BEING A MATERIAL SACRIFICE THEREIN, AND AN EXCLUSIVE CLERICAL SACRIFICING PRIESTHOOD CONNECTED THEREWITH, SHOWN TO BE REFUGNANT TO HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE MOST CERTAIN TEACHING OF THE FATHERS.

1. THE interpretation which the chief Roman Catholic divines give to the phrases, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' is plainly contradictory to the unanimous consent of all antiquity, and is a gross violation of their own stringent canon of interpretation. (See ch. i. 16-21.) Casting it aside, they have recourse to private Greek criticism which we shall briefly examine, for we have undertaken to show that the Roman Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist is contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture, and also to Holy Scripture as interpreted by the early Fathers. We believe that the Scriptures themselves, and as thus interpreted, teach that Christ affirmed of the bread, 'This is my body, and of the wine, 'This is my 'blood.' These are the points which we shall now examine, beginning with Scripture apart from patristic interpretation.

2. Roman Catholic divines deny that Christ said of bread, 'This is my body,' or of wine, 'This is my blood,' and they say, that if Christ had said that the bread was His body, and the wine was His blood, His language must be understood figuratively, and not literally, even as we understand the phrase, 'The seven kine are seven years.' There certainly is some peculiarity in the original Greek. The word which, in our version, is translated 'this,' appears not to agree grammatically with the word translated bread, the two words being of two different genders. Romanists make the best of this seeming advantage. How they speak shall now be shown. Bellarmine says,

'For the word "this" is either understood adjectively or substantively; if adjectively, it ought to agree with the substantive, therefore it cannot denote the bread, but the body. For "bread" is of the masculine gender both in Latin and in Greek, but the word "this," as given in both, is in the neuter gender, and agrees with the word "body," which is of the neuter gender. Likewise in the other form, the word "wine," in the Greek, is of the masculine gender, and the "blood," of the neuter. But the Lord does not say, "this" [agreeing in gender with wine], but "this" [agreeing in gender with Blood]. But, on the contrary, in the Latin, the "wine" is of the neuter gender, and the "blood" of the masculine, and yet all read "This [agreeing in gender with blood] is blood," not "this [agreeing in gender with wine] wine is blood." If it is understood substantively, then the sense will be this, that is, "this thing is my body," but if the word this, or this thing is said of the bread, the proposition is most absurd; for "this" (neuter) cannot be said of a thing

‘which is seen, and openly known, unless that thing be of the neuter gender. For no one, when pointing to his brother would say, this (neuter) is my brother; or, when pointing to an image of Caesar, could it be said, “This (neuter) is Caesar;” therefore, it could not be rightly said of the bread, which the disciples saw, “This is my body.” (*De Sacra. Euch.*, lib. i., cap. x. vol. III., col. 425.)

Cornelius à Lapide and Dr Wiseman have expressed substantially the same criticism. (See ch. iv. 42, and for the full sentiments of Dr Wiseman see 34 19.)

3. This criticism is of no real value to the Romanists, for it is only one out of several modes, though the most plausible, in which they explain the phrase, ‘This is my body,’ and even admitting that these are right who thus explain it, and those Romanists are all wrong who explain it otherwise, yet their doctrine cannot be really founded upon it; the only advantage is that the phrase, as thus explained, is not so directly against their doctrine, but it certainly does not teach it. The bread which our Lord took into His hands was simple, common bread, but before he pronounced the words, ‘This is my body,’ its character and use were changed by the act of blessing or thanksgiving, and was thus set apart from a common to a sacred use, and to use the words of Origen and Zwingli, had become a ‘typical,’ ‘symbolical,’ ‘sacramental,’ ‘mystical,’ and ‘vicarious’ thing. (11 5, 29 22.) It was not then of simple bread that Christ said, ‘This is my body,’ but of bread in its new and entirely altered condition, so that in truth the word ‘this’ relates rather to the bread thus altered than to the word body. This might be illustrated by several phrases from the Greek version of the Old Testament, but one shall suffice. ‘How dreadful is this [masculine agreeing with] place, this [neuter not agreeing with place, nor with any thing which follows] is nothing else, than the ‘house of God, and the gate of heaven itself.’ (ὡς φοβερὸς ὁ τόπος οὗτος· οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο, ἀλλ’ ἡ οἰκος Θεοῦ, καὶ αὐτὴ πύλη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.) (Gen. xxviii. 17.) Here the sacred writer, in referring to the place characterized by such solemn events, ceases to define it by a masculine form and defines it by a neuter one. In this instance, the word ‘this,’ cannot relate to any thing which follows, but must relate to the word ‘place’ though now as signalized by most important events.

4. This apparent anomaly, however, admits of a better explanation. It is generally acknowledged that our Lord, in the celebration of the Passover, used the common language of the country, which was not the Greek, but the Syro-Chaldaic. All divines, Roman Catholic not excepted, consider that the phrase, 'Behold,' or 'this is the blood of the covenant' (Ex. xxiv. 8, and Heb. ix. 20) was the one which our Saviour used in relation to the cup. (See ch. iii. 11-16, 55-62.) In the Hebrew Scriptures and in the Greek version of them, we have 'Behold the blood of the covenant' (Ex. xxiv. 8), but the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews cites the phrase thus, 'This is the blood of the covenant.' (Heb. ix. 20.) Sometimes the Greek Septuagint expresses the Hebrew after the same manner. Thus in Habakkuk we have in the Hebrew, '*Behold*, is it not of the Lord of hosts' (ii. 13), which in the Greek is rendered, 'Are not *these things* ($\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\acute{\alpha}$) of the Lord Almighty.' It is more than probable that our Lord followed the Hebrew form of expression, and said, 'Behold,' or 'here is my blood of the new covenant,' which His servants St Matthew and St Mark expressed thus, 'This is my blood of the new covenant' (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24.); after the same manner as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has expressed the like phrase. But if the use of the Greek $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ (this) is here correctly explained, the same word in relation to the bread may be accounted for after the same manner. In the Chaldee Targum of Onkelos we have as a translation of the Hebrew, '*Behold* (סֵךְ) the 'blood of the covenant' (Ex. xxiv. 8), and in the ritual of the Jews the one who presides at the Passover feast, while holding bread in his hands, is represented as saying, '*Behold* (סֵךְ) the bread of affliction which our fathers did eat,' &c. The first part of this phrase is given by Buxtorf in his Talmudical Lexicon. In the Mishna, in the treatise Pesachim, ch. x. 5, we are told, 'Rabbon Gamaliel says, "Whosoever "does not mention three things on the Passover, has not "fulfilled his duty." These are, the paschal sacrifice, the 'unleavened cakes, and bitter herbs.' We are instructed by the learned Dr Lightfoot how this duty was performed by the Jew who presided. 'He saith, "This is the Passover which

“ we eat, because that the Lord passed over the houses of
 “ our fathers in Egypt.” And holding up the bitter herbs
 ‘ in his hand, he saith, “ These are the bitter herbs that we
 “ eat in remembrance that the Egyptians made the lives of
 “ our fathers bitter in Egypt.” And holding up the un-
 ‘ leavened bread likewise in his hand, he saith, “ This is the
 “ unleavened bread which we eat, because the dough of our
 “ fathers had not time to be leavened, before the Lord
 “ revealed Himself, and redeemed them out of hand.”’
 (*Works*, vol. i. p. 964.)

5. In a book called ‘*Fortalitium Fidei contra Judæos*,’ written in the year 1458, and printed A.D. 1494, in which are recorded the arguments of a Jew against transubstantiation, and which are given as relating to the present point as follows :

‘ And when Christ said, “ This is my body,” holding bread in His hands . . . after the manner we Jews do, on the day of unleavened bread ; for we take unleavened bread in memory of that time when ‘ our fathers were brought out of the land of Egypt, and were not ‘ permitted to stay so long there as whilst the bread might be ‘ leavened, that was the bread of the Passover ; and we say, “ This is “ the bread which our fathers ate,” though that be not present, since ‘ it is past and gone ; and so this unleavened bread reminds us of the ‘ bread of Egypt, and this bread is not that ; so is that bread of ‘ which the sacrifice of the altar is made. It is sufficient for Chris- ‘ tians to say, that it is in memory of that bread of Christ, though ‘ this bread be not that. . . . When therefore your Christ at the ‘ table took bread, and the cup, and gave them to His disciples, he ‘ did not bid them believe that the bread and wine were turned into ‘ His body and blood, but as often as they did that, they should do it ‘ in remembrance of Him.’ (*A Preservative against Popery*, vol. ii. pp. 250, 251.)

6. From this we learn, with great probability, what our Lord intended by taking the bread into His hands, and saying, ‘ *Behold*’ (ἰδοὺ), or as given in Greek by the three Evangelists and St Paul, ‘ *This* (τοῦτο) is my body.’

7. However the Roman Catholics may differ as to their interpretation of the word ‘ this,’ in the words of institution, they generally agree that if Christ affirmed of bread that it was His body, then most certainly the phrase, ‘ This is my ‘ body,’ is a figure of speech. Bellarmine is very explicit

upon this point. In giving what he considered to be the sentiments of Luther on the sacraments, he says :—

‘In the book on the captivity of Babylon, in the chapter on Baptism, he affirmed that sacraments do not justify, but are naked signs. From which it appears to be rightly inferred that Christ is not, in reality, in the Eucharist : for what purpose should He be there, if bound to confer nothing upon us? In the same book, in the chapter on the Eucharist, he denied that the Sixth of John relates to the Eucharist. But this was the chief cause why the Sacramentarians denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. In the same book he wrote that the words of the Evangelist, “This is my body,” give this meaning, “This bread is my body;” and this sentence either must be understood figuratively, that bread is the body of Christ significatively, or it is plainly absurd and impossible, for it cannot possibly be that bread should be the body of Christ. Therefore the disciples of Luther chose rather to have recourse to a figure than to admit a plain absurdity.’ (*De Euchar.*, lib. i., cap. 1, vol. iii. cc. 389, 390).

7. Again he states :—

‘Therefore by blessing He either changed the bread into His body in reality, truly and properly, or He changed it improperly and figuratively, by adding a signification which it had not, or He changed it in no manner. If He changed it into the reality truly and properly, then He gave bread which was changed, and of that changed bread He said most truly “This is my body,” that is, what is contained under the form of bread is no longer bread, but body, and this is that which Catholics say. But if any one says that bread is changed figuratively, yet bread was given to the apostles which, figuratively, was the Lord’s body, and the words “This is my body,” have this meaning, “This bread is a figure of my body.” This is the opinion of the Sacramentarians, which both we and the Lutherans reject by common consent. If, in fine, any one says that no change is made, he is compelled to say that the bread given to the apostles was not changed, and that of that it was said, “This is my body,” that is, this true and wheaten bread is truly and properly my body. We maintain that this is in no way to be admitted either of the thing itself or of the proposition, for in no way can it come to pass, that one thing is not changed, and yet is made another; for it might be, and it might not be. But in an affirmative proposition it is necessary that the subject and the predicate refer to the same thing, otherwise what is predicated would be false. Therefore it cannot be that the proposition should be true in which the subject stands for bread, and the predicate for the body of Christ; for bread and the body of Christ are most different things.’ (*Ibid.*, lib. iii., c. 19, tom. iii., cc. 619, 620.)

8. Again he states :—

‘I answer that the pronoun “this” does not designate material bread, we have fully shown in the first book in the tenth and eleventh chapters, nor is it necessary to repeat those things here; for that the pronoun “this” designates material bread avails for Calvinists, against whom we have spoken. But this is not only of no avail to Lutherans, but is very much against them. Wherefore I very much wonder at the imprudence of Luther and Kenmitius, and others, who so strenuously urge that bread is designated by this pronoun, for as much more strongly they prove this, so much more strongly do they bind and impede themselves. For as we have said above, if the Lord said, “This bread is my body,” it necessarily follows that the Lord’s opinion is false, if truly material bread is properly said to be the Lord’s body, that plainly implies a contradiction; either bread is not properly, but figuratively, body, which the Calvinists suppose; or therefore bread, not remaining bread, but by blessing is changed into the body of the Lord, which is the most true opinion of the Catholic Church.’ (*Ibid.*, lib. iii., cap. 23, tom. iii., cc. 637, 638.)

9. We have cited Bellarmine more fully than was necessary for the point in hand, that the reader may see how confidently he maintains that if Christ said of bread it was His body, He spoke figuratively, and that we may exhibit this writer’s apparently conclusive argument against Lutherans and all who maintain, like Dr Pusey and most of his numerous disciples, that Christ affirmed literal or wheaten bread to be His real body which was born of Mary, and the bread still continuing to be bread.

10. Dr Wiseman also maintains, with all Roman Catholics, that if Christ had said, ‘Bread is my body,’ ‘Wine is my blood,’ this, ‘in point of construction, would have brought these words within a possibility of a comparison with the “Seven kine are seven years,” or “the horns are kings.”’ (34 19.) In other words, that our Lord spoke figuratively. Vazquez, Suarez, Fisher, and almost all the Roman Catholic divines maintain the same thing.

11. Now nothing is more certain than that the Fathers generally considered that Christ did say of Bread that it was His body, and of wine, that it was His blood, and that they commonly call these compound substances not only Christ’s body and blood, but call them by their original names as descriptive of what they really and naturally were, viz., bread and wine. Here follow their own statements.

12. IGNATIUS speaks of breaking one bread. (3 2.) JUSTIN of the deacons 'giving to each of those present to partake of 'the bread and wine and water.' (7 1.) 'We do not receive 'it as common bread, or as common drink.' 'From which 'food our blood and flesh are by transmutation nourished.' (7 2.) 'In remembrance made by their food, both solid '[bread] and liquid [wine].' (7 5.) IRENEUS states, 'He 'took that which of his creation is bread, and gave thanks, 'saying, "This is my body." And likewise the cup which is 'of our creation, He confessed to be his blood.' (8 1.) 'They 'know certainly that the bread over which thanks are given 'is the body of their Lord.' (8 4.) CLEMENT of Alexandria says, 'The Lord too partook of wine, saying,' &c. (9 7.) 'The 'Saviour, taking the bread first spake and blessed, then 'breaking the bread, He presented it.' (9 9.) TERTULLIAN, 'In the bread is understood His body.' (10 2.) 'Bread 'wherewith He represents His own very body.' (10 8.) 'Calling His body bread.' (10 10.) 'He made His own body 'bread by saying, "This is my body." His body was bread.' (10 12.) 'Calling His body bread.' (10 13.) ORIGEN, 'One 'and the same excellent power in the bread and in the cup.' (11 4.) 'Nor does that which enters into the mouth, and 'which is called the bread of the Lord, make the man holy.' 'Not eating of the bread sanctified by the Word of God.' 'And the food which is consecrated by the Word of God and 'prayer doth according to the material part itself "go into the '"belly."' (11 5.) 'That bread which God the Word owneth 'to be His body.' 'That drink which God the Word owneth 'to be His blood.' (11 12.) 'But why did He not say, "This ' "is the bread of the New Testament?"' (11 14.) 'Therefore 'the Saviour will eat and drink that bread and paschal drink.' (11 15.) 'And shows that when He strengthens them with 'this bread that it is His own body.' (11 16.) 'He is both 'the bread, and he eats the bread with us; He Himself is 'both the drink of the fruit of the vine, and He drinks it 'with us.' (11 18.) 'When thou receivest the sacramental 'bread.' (11 31.) 'He says that the bread and the cup of 'blessing are the communion both of the blood and the flesh.' (11 48.) 'Eat the bread offered with thanksgiving.' (11 50.)

CYPRIAN, 'Christ offered bread and wine, namely, His own body and blood.' (12 4.) 'And that was wine which he called his blood.' (12 6.) 'The Lord calls his body bread.' 'He calls His blood wine.' (12 9.) EUSEBIUS, 'The mystical wine which He gave to His disciples, saying, "Take drink, "this is my blood." But ordained that they should use bread as the symbol of His own body.' (14 4.) CYRIL of Jerusalem, 'Since then He Himself has declared and said of the bread, "This is my body," who shall dare to doubt any longer.' (15 12.) JEROME, 'Let us hear that the bread which the Lord brake and gave to His disciples was the body of the Lord our Saviour.' (18 20.) 'By the offering of bread and wine, that is, the body and blood of the Lord Jesus.' (18 22.) 'We pollute bread, that is the body of Christ.' (18 47.) GAUDENTIUS, 'Christ sufficiently declares all wine which is offered in the figure of His passion is His blood.' (19 4.) 'When he reached forth the consecrated bread and wine to His disciples, He said, "This is my body, "this is my blood."' (19 9.)

13. AUGUSTINE, 'Nor marks of letters written upon skins do we call the body and blood of Christ, but that alone which taken of the fruits of the earth [viz., bread and wine], and consecrated with mystic prayer, we receive to our spiritual health.' (21 18.) 'As bread made for this purpose of signification is consumed in receiving the sacrament.' (21 19.) 'So then the Eucharist is our daily bread; but let us in such wise receive it, that we be not refreshed in our bodies only, but in our souls.' (21 120.) 'The bread is the body of Christ, the cup the blood of Christ.' 'How then is the bread His body? and the cup, or what the cup contains, how is it His blood?' (21 135). CHRYSOSTOM, 'For what is the bread? The body of Christ.' (22 21.) THEODORET, 'The Lord too has called the mystic or sacramental wine blood.' (23 1.) 'He then called the blood of the Saviour the blood of the grape, as we call the mystic fruit of the vine, after the consecration, the blood of the Lord.' (23 39.) 'Dost thou know that God entitled His own body bread? He called the bread his body, and that which is mixed blood.' On his body He placed the name of the symbol,

‘and on the symbol that of the body; and so having named ‘Himself a vine, He entitled the symbol blood.’ ‘He that ‘entitled His body, that is so by nature, wheat and bread, ‘and again named Himself a Vine, He honoured the visible ‘symbols [bread and wine] with the title of body and blood.’ (23 40.) ‘The Lord also, when He took the symbol [bread] ‘. . . . said, “This is my body.”’ (23 41.) ‘The mystical ‘symbols [bread and wine] whereof are they the symbols? ‘of that which is truly the body and blood of Christ.’ (23 43.) ‘How dost thou call these [the elements] after their consecration? The body and blood of Christ.’ ‘For neither ‘after the consecration do the mystic symbols depart from ‘their own nature. For they remain in their former substance and figure and form.’ (23 45.) ‘But the mystical ‘symbol changes its former name. For it is no longer named ‘what it was called before, but is entitled body.’ (23 46.)

14. This is but a portion of the unanimous consent of the Fathers in regard to Christ calling his body bread, or the bread His body, and their speaking of bread and wine after consecration as being in their nature and substance still bread and wine. But Stapleton, a leading Roman Catholic divine, on the 26th chapter of Matthew affirms, ‘Christ did not say, “This bread is my body,” and no catholic will admit it.’ This is quite true of the modern Roman Catholics, but is a flat contradiction to the ancient and true catholics. The Roman Catholic divines now maintain that if Christ said, ‘This bread is my body,’ or that is understood to be what he meant, He used a figure of speech, meaning that the bread was not really His body, but only figuratively or symbolically so. Thus far we agree with these Roman doctors, and conclude from their own admission, coupled with the above most certain testimony of the Fathers, that Christ did not teach that what he called His body was really His body which was born of Mary, nor what He called His blood, was really His blood which was shed by the soldier’s spear. Dr Pusey and most of those who own him as their teacher, strenuously maintain that Christ affirmed of bread that it was His body, and not His body figuratively, but the body which was crucified; and of wine that it was His blood, and not His blood

figuratively, but the blood which was shed from His sacred body, and also that the bread and wine of which our Lord affirmed these things, were unchanged in their nature and substance. The reader will do well to bear in mind that notwithstanding this plainly contradictory teaching between the Roman divines and Dr Pusey, both parties in some incomprehensible manner arrive at exactly the same conclusion, viz., that after consecration, the elements either become, or are changed into, the real body and blood of Christ, as defined above. The means by which they come to this unaccountable result are to us of secondary importance, our object being to prove that the conclusion to which they do come is alike contrary to the Holy Scriptures and early antiquity. Even in very bad systems of teaching, one system may be less absurd than another, and we decidedly maintain that the real teaching of comparatively modern Romanists is less absurd, and less offensive to the understanding than that of Dr Pusey. By a fair comparison of the two systems, it will be found that Dr Pusey in the defence of his doctrine far surpasses the real Romanist in his daring and quixotic freaks of credulity, one of which we shall have to notice presently.

15. Some of his own disciples appear to obtain mental relief in believing the simpler doctrine of transubstantiation. Mr Cobb, who has publicly expressed his sincere admiration of Dr Pusey's work, and acknowledged his gratitude to God for it, yet notwithstanding states,

'I fearlessly assert that when once the mind grasps the idea of the "Real Objective Presence" aright, it asserts for itself, then and there, the Roman doctrine of "Transubstantiation;" and it cannot deny it, without flatly contradicting reason. . . . If this be her doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, then either there must have been a *change of substance*, or else a primary law of reason is *contradicted*. That primary law is, that a thing cannot be two things at once in the strict sense of the word "be," i.e., it cannot substantially be two things at once. A thing may be "accidentally" at one time, *one* thing, and at another time *another*; just as, in our instance, the same thing was at one time "accidentally" corn, and at another "accidentally" flour. But a thing can never be "substantially" two things at once. There cannot be two "substances" under one set of "accidents." It is not merely that the human mind sinks powerlessly back in every effort to conceive such a thing—for here faith could come to the rescue, and we could believe that

'which we cannot conceive, and assert that which we cannot demonstrate. No! such a supposition does far more than this—it *flatly contradicts* reason, it does *open violence* to its dictates. "If a thing *is* A, it cannot (at the same time and in the same sense of the word) *be* "B," is a law of the irresistible, uncompromising force of which every child is conscious, however unable he may be to express it in words; and it is this law which is contradicted when we say that the Eucharist is both bread and the Lord's body at the same time, and in the same sense of the word "is." It can be, and is "accidentally" bread; and it can be, and is, "substantially" the Lord's body; but it cannot be *both* "substantially," any more than it can (at the same time) be *both* accidentally.'—(*The Kiss of Peace*, pp. 62, 64, 65.)

16. We think, however, that Dr Pusey has considerably changed his views since he published his teaching on the doctrine of the Eucharist during 1843-1857, and that now his faith is substantially the same as that of the modern Roman church not only as to the nature of the presence, but even as to the very mode. In 1855 he said, 'The word *transubstantiation* does not occur, I believe, before the twelfth century. So far, then, from this variety of words used to express the change of the consecrated elements being any argument in favour of the modern explanation of that change, it tells the other way. The Fathers use words which do *not* express the doctrine now currently received; they use words which only in a vague way express change, without in the least implying of what sort that change is; still less implying any change of *substance*. They do NOT use the *one* word, now used universally in the Roman church, which *does* express change of substance (*μετεμύωσις*) or "*transubstantiation*."' (*Notes*, &c., p. 169.) But in 1865 Dr Pusey says, 'Archbishop Plato, in the Greek church, admits the term *μετεμύωσις* (transubstantiation) in a sense which, if proposed to it, the English church must accept.' (*Eirenicon*, p. 25.)

17. When Dr Pusey tells us that the English Church must accept transubstantiation as held by the Greek Church, he displays marvellous assurance, surpassed only by credulity. The statement, however, shows that his belief and that of the Greek Church in regard to the doctrine of transubstantiation is the same, and that in 1865 he believes what he denied in

1855. It remains now that we give authentic statements respecting this belief of transubstantiation as held by the Greek Church, and which Dr Pusey says the English Church must accept if proposed to it. Dr Pusey himself quotes what follows from an early Lutheran Confession. 'We learn that 'the Roman Church is not alone in affirming the corporal 'presence of Christ, inasmuch as the Greek Church both now 'so holdeth, and held so formerly. For the Canon of the 'Mass among them so attests, wherein the priest distinctly 'prays, that the bread being changed, it may become the 'body of Christ. And the Bulgarian [Theophylact], no mean 'writer, we think, says plainly that the bread is not a figure 'only, but is truly changed into flesh.' (*Notes, &c.*, p. 33.)

18. This is the most suitable place to give the testimony of Theophylact, who lived in the eleventh or twelfth century, and who is one of the most important Greek Christian commentators since the doctrine of the real presence in the consecrated elements was invented. He does not use the Greek word equivalent to the word transubstantiation, but he appears to hold the same doctrine of the real presence, although not so defined as to its mode. In his commentary on St Mark xiv. 22, he states, "'This is my body," this, I 'say, which ye take for the bread is not an antitype of the 'Lord's body, but is changed (*μεταβάλλεται*) into the very 'body of Christ. For the Lord says, "The bread which I "'will give is my flesh." He did not say, it is an antitype 'of my flesh, but it is my flesh; and again, "Except ye eat "'the flesh of the Son of man." And how is it, says one, 'that flesh doth not appear? O man, that comes to pass on 'account of our infirmity.' (*Comment. in Quat. Evang.*, p. 272.) Again, on John vi. 51, he states, 'But observe the bread which 'is eaten of us in the mysteries, is not only a certain antitype of 'the Lord's flesh, but is itself the Lord's flesh, for He does not 'say, "The bread which I will give" is the antitype of my "'flesh, but is my flesh," that bread by mystical blessing in 'unutterable words, and by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost is 'transmade (*μεταποιεῖται*) into the flesh of Christ the Lord.' (*Ibid.*, pp. 651, 652.) If that is not the doctrine of the real presence, as taught by the Roman Church, it is very much like it.

19. The branch of the Greek Church in Russia, according to Platon, one of its bishops, maintains the same doctrine. Under the heading of the Eucharist, which he considers to be one of the seven mysteries or sacraments, he says: 'Every true Christian ought to be firmly assured that under the sign of that holy bread he partakes of the real body of Christ Himself, &c. Under the sign also of that holy wine he communicates of the real blood of Christ which flowed from His holy side.' (*The present State of the Greek Church in Russia*, by Robert Pinkerton, 1814, pp. 181, 182.) In a note in the same book we are informed that 'The Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation has crept into the Greek Church, not only among the Russians, but also in the Eastern churches.' (pp. 2, 3.)

20. Dean Goode, in his excellent pamphlet on 'The Eastern Churches,' has given us the exact doctrine of the Greek Church as stated by themselves in their own authentic, or what they call 'Orthodox, Confession.'

21. 'The priest must believe that at the time when he consecrates the gifts, the very substance of the bread and the substance of the wine is changed into the substance of the true body and blood of Christ, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, of whom he makes intercession at that moment, that he will perfect this sacrament, invoking Him, and saying, "Send down thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts that lie before thee, and make this bread the precious body of thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the precious blood of thy Christ, changing them by thy Holy Spirit." For after these words the transubstantiation (*ἡ μετασυστάσις*) immediately takes place, and the bread is changed into the true body of Christ, and the wine into His true blood.' In another authentic document we are told—

'In the celebration of this sacrament we believe our Lord Jesus Christ is present, not figuratively, nor by a superabounding grace, as in other sacraments, nor by a simple presence, as some of the Fathers have said concerning Baptism, nor by impanation, so that the Divinity of the Word is hypostatically joined to the bread of the Eucharist that lies before us, as the Lutherans, very unlearnedly and miserably suppose, but truly and actually; so that, after the consecration of the bread and wine, the bread is changed, transubstantiated, (*μετασυστάσθαι*), converted, transformed into the true body of our

‘Lord, which was born in Bethlehem of the Ever-virgin, &c., and the wine is converted and *transubstantiated* into the very true blood of our Lord, which, when He hung upon the cross, was poured out for the life of the world. Moreover, that after the consecration of the bread and wine, the substance of bread no longer remains. Moreover, that in each piece and smallest morsel of the changed bread and wine, there is not a portion of the body and blood of our Lord—for this notion is blasphemous and impious—but the Lord Christ, whole and entire substantially; that is, with His soul and divinity, namely, perfect God and perfect man. . . . Moreover, that the very body and blood of the Lord, which are in the sacrament of the Eucharist, ought to be honoured with supreme honour, and worshipped with the worship of *latria*. And those who violate this doctrine the Catholic Church of Christ rejects and anathematizes.’ *Dosithe. Confess. Decr.*, 17, pp. 457-463; *From the ‘Eastern Churches,’ by Dean Goodale.*)

22. Archdeacon Freeman states; ‘In 1672 the Western doctrine of the annihilation of the elements was formally affirmed on behalf of the four Greek Patriarchates by the Council of Bethlehem.’ Here the following note is given from Neale, ‘*Harduin*, tom xi., 180:’ ‘We believe that after the consecration, the substance of the bread and wine no longer remains, [the Russian form is, ‘The very bread and wine no longer remain’], but the very body and blood of our Lord under the appearance of bread and wine; that is to say, under the accidents of the bread [the Russian omits this]. Further, that in any portion the Lord Jesus is present in His substance, that is, with His soul and divinity, as perfect God and perfect man. We further believe that the body and blood of the Lord ought to be honoured and worshipped with divine worship.’ (*Concil. Bethlechem*, art. 17. *Principles of Divine Service*, vol. ii., pt. 1, pp. 71, 72.)

23. We have cited thus much of the faith of the so-called orthodox Greek Church to show, not only what kind of faith Dr Pusey holds, but that the reader may see what the faith of that church is in regard to the real presence, which we have undertaken to examine and to show to be contrary to the Holy Scriptures and to the teaching of the Fathers of the first eight centuries. It is truly lamentable to think that some of our Bishops and many of our church are intent on having visible communion with that system of superstition and gross ignorance.

24. There is one thing which we have reserved for a separate consideration, namely, the fact that our Lord gave to the consecrated element the name of its natural substance, 'the fruit of the vine, as much as he called it His blood.' Now, Dr Pusey, and nearly all his disciples, believe that consecrated Eucharistic wine, is really wine in substance, and at the same time is really Christ's blood in substance. His strong faith on this point, and his exercise of it in the face of such insuperable difficulties is truly marvellous, and he not only believes the thing itself, but also believes that the Fathers believed it. This part of his faith we are now about to examine. He states,

'Our Lord, according to S. Matthew, spoke the words, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom," after the consecration of the cup. "Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth," &c. (xxvi. 27-29.) Each part of these words suggests an argument for our belief. Our Lord as distinctly says, "this fruit of the vine," as He says, "This is my body." He calls that which he had consecrated, and of which He had said, "This is my blood of the New Testament," by the name of the natural element; "the fruit of the vine," as S. Paul calls the other element, after its consecration, by its natural name "bread." All the Fathers, then, who believed these words to have been spoken by our Lord, in the place where S. Matthew and S. Mark distinctly place them, *i.e.*, after the consecration of the cup, believed certainly that our Lord gave to the consecrated element the name of its natural substance, "the fruit of the vine," as much as He called it His blood. . . . But if any Fathers hold that our Lord did mean to speak of natural drinking of wine after His resurrection, then they must have understood him to speak of that which He had consecrated to be His blood, as being in its natural substance, wine. When he said, "I will no more drink this fruit of the vine, until I drink it new," &c., we cannot suppose, that if He meant it of the natural substance after His resurrection, He meant it of what was not a natural substance then.' (*Notes, &c.*, pp. 69-71.)

In the same book he further states,

'Our Lord's words, "until I drink it new," were taken from the first in their literal sense, since they were, S. Jerome says, the groundwork of the belief that wine should be drunk, whether sacramentally or carnally, in the millennium.' (p. 134.)

25. All this, with the exception of the words 'consecrated

‘to be His blood,’ we accept as being quite true, and regard it as being most fatal to the comparatively modern doctrine of transubstantiation. But now comes the question to be considered, to use the words of Dr Pusey, ‘whether the ‘wine should be drunk sacramentally or carnally,’ that is, whether certain Fathers considered ‘the fruit of the vine’ to be drunk in the millennium would be simple wine, or wine which was also the blood of Christ, for that is what Dr Pusey means by drinking the fruit of the vine sacramentally. He maintains that the millenarian Fathers held the latter view. But he shall speak for himself. He begins by citing Jerome.

“From this place (Matt. xxvi. 29) some build a fable of 1000 years, “in which they contend that Christ shall reign in the body, and shall “drink wine, which from that time unto the consummation of the “world He had not drunk.” (18 19.) Among these millenarians he ‘counts in different places “many of the ancients,” “many of our “people,” and in his own time, “a very great multitude.” Especially, he names Papias, Victorinus, Lactantius, Severus, Nepos, and ‘these as eminent only among others. Both S. Justin Martyr, and ‘S. Irenæus bear witness to its being a very prevailing doctrine. Eusebius says that it had been embraced by “far the greatest number of Church writers.” I have shown elsewhere that S. Jerome ‘is historically wrong in attributing to S. Irenæus and Tertullian, and ‘probably to Nepos, the doctrine of a carnal millennium. But S. ‘Justin and S. Irenæus do, as he says, look upon a literal eating and ‘drinking as a fulfilment of our Lord’s words, S. Justin says, “He “said that He should come again to Jerusalem, and there again eat “and drink with the disciples.” S. Irenæus, “He promised to drink “of the fruit of the vine with His disciples, showing both the inheritance of the earth, in which the new fruit of the vine is drunk, and “the resurrection of His disciples in the flesh. For the new flesh “which rises, is the same as that which receiveth the new cup. For “not above, in the place above the heavens, can He be understood as “drinking the fruit of the vine with His disciples, nor, again, are they “without flesh who drink it; for the drink which is received from “the vine belongs to the flesh, not to the spirit.” (8 6.) I cannot ‘doubt that those Fathers meant, not ordinary, but Eucharistic, eating and drinking, yet still they meant such Eucharistic eating, as ‘implied the reception of the natural substances of bread and wine.’ (Pp. 134-136.)

26. If saints, after the resurrection in the flesh, drink the natural fruit of the vine as Irenæus here plainly intimates, it certainly is something very much like a carnal eating, if it is not really so. But before coming to a conclusion upon this

point, it will be well to have more information respecting these millenarians. Jerome, in his commentary on the latter part of the 37th chapter of Ezekiel, states,

‘For if Jews and Judaizing Christians refer these things to the reign of a thousand years, of necessity they are compelled to admit, that all who have been saved shall dwell in the land of Israel, the building of Jerusalem, the erecting of the temple, the performing of all the ceremonies of the law, the observing of the Sabbath, the receiving of the mutilation of circumcision, eating, and drinking, and esteeming an abundance of riches in the place of the chief happiness and all power, whereas the apostle says, “Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy both it and them.” But the former prophetic discourse showed by the type of a resurrection the restoration of the Jewish people was not carnal, but spiritual, and so this prophecy by no means pertains to the happiness of the flesh, but to that of the mind.’ (Tom. v. p. 513.)

27. Augustine states the views of the millenarians thus, ‘They say that they who shall then rise again, shall be wholly given up to most immoderate carnal feasts, in which there shall be so much eating and drinking, as not only to preserve no moderation, but even to pass the bounds of heathenism itself; these things cannot be believed except by carnal men. But they who are spiritual, call those who believe these things by a Greek term, Chiliasts, whom we, rendering literally, may term millenarians.’ (*De Civ. Dei* lib. xx. c. 7, tom. v. p. 260.)

28. Gennadius, a presbyter of the Church of Marseilles, who died about the year 492, states, ‘In the divine promises, we look for nothing earthly or transitory, as the Melitans hope, no marriage-union, according to the phrenzy of Cerinthius and Marcion; nothing pertaining to meat or to drink as Irenæus, Tertullian, and Lactantius, assenting to Papias; nor do we hope that for 1000 years after the resurrection, the reign of Christ will be on the earth, and that the saints will reign with Him amid delights, as Nepos taught.’ (*De Eccles. Dogm.*, cap. xxv. (cap. lv.) *Corporis Hæreselogici* tom. I. p. 349.)

29. From the testimony of Jerome it would seem that they were very numerous who believe that the saints after their resurrection would live upon earth again and drink the natural fruit of the vine. (See sec. 25 above.) Dr Pusey

admits that the millenarians taught this, and cites Irenæus to that effect. (Sec. 25 above.) Doubtless this, in the judgment of Jerome, Augustine, and Gennadius, was considered as carnal, that is, not spiritual. But Dr Pusey has told us 'that Jerome is historically wrong in attributing to St Irenæus the doctrine of a carnal millennium.' But how does he attempt to show this? By assuming what is contrary to the plainest teaching of Holy Scripture, and as interpreted by all the Fathers except some of the millenarian ones, namely, that after the second coming of Christ His risen saints received the fruit of the vine in its natural substance, and in his opinion in or with it the real blood of Christ, even as they had done when they were alive in their natural bodies, and before Christ had come a second time; whereas Holy Scripture distinctly states that sacramental participation (however explained) was to be only 'till He come.' (1 Cor. xi. 26.) Theodoret has well expressed the sentiments of the Fathers. He says, 'For after His coming, there will be no more need of the symbols of His body and blood, since His body itself will appear.' (23 29.) Dr Pusey does not pretend to give any reason for his vain assumption, viz., that the millenarian fathers believed that the fruit of the vine, which the risen saints were to drink, was also to be the real blood of Christ. Surely two such notable Fathers as Jerome and Augustine must have known the real sentiments of the millenarians much better than Dr Pusey, and their statements of their views, including the distinct testimony of Gennadius, are absolutely fatal to any such notion.

30. The chief millenarian witness on whom Dr Pusey relies, is Irenæus. What he has cited from him respecting drinking the fruit of the vine, and what he has omitted to cite respecting the abundance of that fruit, may be seen in 8 7, which the reader is especially requested to consider. Of the fruit of the vine which the risen saints were to drink, Dr Pusey says, 'I cannot doubt that those Fathers meant not 'ordinary, but Eucharistic eating and drinking.' (See sec. 25 above.) Irenæus then goes on to show how very abundant the sacramental elements would be,—at least so Dr Pusey regards them. A single vine, according to the account given,

would produce as much wine as would cover the whole surface of the globe about 40 miles deep, and a grain of wheat would yield 446,000 tons of fine flour, exclusive of bran and sharps. We may presume that the vines and grains of wheat would be as numerous as prolific. The vinous produce would appear to be more abundant than the wheaten, but it should be borne in mind that grains of wheat are more numerous than vines, and the surface of the globe usually devoted to the growing of wheat is very much larger than that set apart for the growing of the vine. It might well be doubted whether this ample supply would be restricted to the sacramental elements. But Dr Pusey doubts not, for he says, 'I cannot doubt that those Fathers meant not ordinary, but Eucharistic, 'eating and drinking;' and its great abundance is employed by him as an argument for its sacramental use; for he says, 'The miraculous nature of the food, further, leads us the more to think of a sacramental eating and drinking.' (*Tertullian. Library of the Fathers*, note D, p. 122.) But surely Dr Pusey must have forgotten that the single vine and the single grain of wheat were given only as specimens of the produce of the respective classes of things to which they belong; for Irenæus, after having given these specimens of abundant production went on to state, 'and that all other fruit-bearing trees, and seeds, and grass, would produce in similar proportions.' (8 7.) Are all these intended for sacramental purposes, the grass not excepted, and does 'the miraculous nature of the food,' as Dr Pusey says, 'lead us the more to think of sacramental 'eating and drinking?' If he can believe this, we cannot. If it is certain that all these other fruit-bearing trees besides the vine, and all other seeds beside those of wheat, and the great abundance of grass, in all its varieties, are not for 'a sacramental eating and drinking,' we may be quite certain that the fruit of a single vine and the produce of a single grain of wheat were not intended exclusively for a sacramental eating and drinking, but were selected merely for the purpose of giving the ratio of produce of the respective classes to which they belong.

31. It might well be asked with astonishment, Does Dr Pusey really believe that this superabundance of wine and

flour was considered by the Fathers to be for the use of the risen saints, and that although Christ was now with them, yet they were to eat and drink His body and blood in this miraculous supply of bread and wine? He verily so believes, as the evidence already given testifies. When it is believed that 'every particle of that Divine Food must be pervaded by the presence which gives it life. It has no relation to quantity. Over and over again, in the smallest portion as in the largest, there must be the same body and blood; the same Christ, whole and undivided' (39 12); 'that under those external forms there is the *true, real, and substantial* presence of Christ's body and blood, animated by the living soul, and both pervaded by the living DEITY—whole CHRIST, GOD, and MAN.' (39 9.) We may well stand amazed at the enormous power of Dr Pusey's faith, exercised as it is in the face of insuperable difficulties; for what possible need could there be of sacramental signs, even though the signs did contain Christ Himself, when He is supposed to be visibly present in His body, drinking the fruit of the vine with His disciples on the earth. It is much to be regretted that a man with such great faith, and of such a rare quality, should not belong to some system of religion, where there would be more ample and legitimate scope for its exercise.

32. How Clement of Alexandria spoke of Christ's drinking the fruit of the vine may be seen. (9 7.) Origen interprets drinking the fruit of the vine spiritually in the kingdom of God, which is not meat and drink. (11 15-18, 27.) Jerome, rejecting carnal and Judaizing notions, interprets drinking the fruit of the vine spiritually after the manner of Origen. (18 19-21, 25, 34, 35, 57, 58.) Chrysostom interprets the phrase as relating to Christ's drinking after his resurrection in proof thereof, but did not conceive that the wine was taken sacramentally; for he says, 'When He had risen, and was setting before them a mere meal without mysteries, He used wine "of the fruit," He saith, "of the vine."' (22 8, 9.) The plain teaching of these Fathers and of the Fathers generally, respecting the fruit of the vine, is fatal to the doctrine of the real presence, whether as held by the Roman Catholics or High Anglican disciples of Paschasius.

33. If, as we have shown, the Fathers unanimously affirm of consecrated bread in the Eucharist that it is Christ's body, and of the wine that it is His blood, but, after consecration, call those elements by their proper names, descriptive of what they really are, viz., 'bread,' 'wine,' or 'the fruit of the vine,' and also call them sacraments, mysteries, types, signs, symbols, antitypes, images, figures, representations, &c.; we should naturally infer that, in alluding to, speaking of, or explaining the phrases, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' they would not give us to understand that Christ meant to say that the bread was really His body, and the wine was really His blood. We have no proof that they ever so taught, but abundant proof that they did not so teach. The following instances are adduced as a specimen of the general teaching of the Fathers.

34. CLEMENT of Alexandria: 'Christ *speaks* of bread as 'flesh.' 'And blood is *figuratively termed* wine.' (9, 4.) 'Thus in many ways the Word *is figuratively represented* as 'meat, and flesh, and food, and bread, and blood, and milk.' 'Let no one think it strange, when we say that the Lord's blood *is figuratively represented* as milk. For is it not *figuratively represented* as wine? (9 5.) 'For know well He too partook of wine; for He too was man. And He blessed the 'wine, saying, "Take ye, drink, this is my blood"—blood 'of the vine. He *allegorically speaks* of the Word who was 'shed for many for the remission of sins. . . . But that 'what was blessed was wine He *showed* again, saying to the 'disciples, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, &c. (9 7.) TERTULLIAN: '*Calling* His body bread.' (10 1.) 'Bread 'wherewith He *represents* His own very body.' (10 8.) '*Calling* His body bread.' (10 10.) 'Why *doth* He *call* His 'body bread?' '*Calling* His body bread.' (10 13.) '*Showing* the wine to be His blood.' (10 14.) ORIGEN: 'For 'God the Word *is called* by divers names, and He Himself is 'innumerable.' (11 18.) 'The Word of God *is also called* 'flesh and bread, and *is called* milk, and *is called* herbs, and 'for the capacity of believers, or the possibility of receiving 'Him, He *is diversely named*.' (11 21.) 'But we are said 'to drink the blood of Christ, not only in the way of sacra-

'ments, but also when we receive His Word.' (11 34.) 'He therefore Himself has been wounded, whose blood we drink, that is, we receive the words of His doctrine.' (11 35.) 'Thou, then, art the true people of Israel, which canst drink blood, and canst eat the flesh of the Word of God and drink His blood, and canst suck up the blood of that grape which is of the true vine, and of those branches which the Father purgeth. The fruit of these branches *is* deservedly *called* the blood of those who are wounded, which we drink from their words and doctrine.' (11 36.)

35. CYPRIAN: 'Nor can His blood *appear* to be in the cup, when the cup is without wine whereby the blood of Christ *is shown* was shed.' (12 3.) 'That the blood of the Lord *may be understood*.' (12 5.) 'Water alone cannot *represent* the blood of Christ.' 'In the water the people *are understood*, but that in the wine *is shown* the blood of Christ,' (12 6.) 'In which sacrament also our people *are shown* to be united. (12 7.) The Lord *calls* His body bread. He *calls* His blood wine.' (12 9.) EUSEBIUS: 'When, therefore, we, having received that, we ought to celebrate the memory of this sacrifice [that of the cross] on the table through the symbols of His body and saving blood, according to the laws of the New Testament.' (14 2.) 'He Himself delivered the symbols of the divine dispensation to His disciples, bidding them *make the image of* His own body.' 'Ordain that they should use bread as the symbol of His own body.' (14 4.) CYRIL: 'How the Saviour *shows* Himself under various forms to each . . . *becomes* a vine, *becomes* a door, *becomes* a High Priest, *becomes* a sheep, *becomes* all things to all.' (15 5.) 'Bread *becomes* the body of Christ.' 'Meats belonging to the pomp of Satan *become* profane,' &c. (15 7.) AMBROSE: 'Therefore drink the cup, both of the Old and New Testament; because thou drinkest Christ in both. Drink Christ because He is the vine.' (17 6.)

36. JEROME: '"For the corn, and wine, and oil," of which the Lord's bread *is made*, and the type of His blood *is completed*, and the blessing of sanctification *is shown*.' (18 28.) 'Since the flesh of the Lord is true food, and His blood is

‘true drink, the spiritual meaning is, that in this present life
 ‘we have one only good to feed on His flesh and to drink
 ‘His blood, not only in the mystery [Eucharist], but also in
 ‘the reading of the Scriptures. For the true food and drink
 ‘which is derived from the Word of God is knowledge of the
 ‘Scriptures.’ (18 49.) ‘I think that the gospel is the body
 ‘of Jesus, that the Holy Scriptures are His doctrine; and
 ‘since He says, “He who doth not eat my flesh and drink
 ‘“my blood,” although also it can be understood in the
 ‘mystery [Eucharist], yet more truly is the word of the Scrip-
 ‘tures the body of Christ, and the divine doctrine is His
 ‘blood.’ (18 50.) ‘If, when we hear the Word of God, the
 ‘Word of God and the flesh of Christ and His blood are
 ‘poured into our ears, &c.’ (18 51.) ‘So also in the flesh of
 ‘Christ, which is the Word of doctrine.’ (18 52.) ‘He takes
 ‘bread which strengtheneth the heart of man, and passes
 ‘to the true paschal sacrament; in order that He Himself
 ‘also *might represent* the reality of His body and blood in
 ‘the same manner as Melchizedek, priest of the Most High
 ‘God, had done, when offering bread and wine in prefigura-
 ‘tion of Him.’ (18 56.) ‘Jesus took bread, and blessing,
 ‘broke, *transfiguring* His own body *into* bread.’ (18 59.)
 ‘But in two ways are the blood and flesh of Christ under-
 ‘stood, either that spiritual and divine, whereof He Himself
 ‘said, “My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink in-
 ‘deed.” And “Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,
 ‘“ye shall not have eternal life;” or the flesh and blood,
 ‘the flesh which was crucified, the blood which was shed by
 ‘the soldier’s spear.’ (18 62.) GAUDENTIUS: ‘Rightly, too,
 ‘*is* the blood *represented* by the form of wine.’ (19 4.)
 ‘We, the faithful, together with all that believe, ought, in
 ‘the mystery as well as in faith, so to eat and commend the
 ‘flesh of the Lamb to the inner recess of our heart.’ (19 15.)
 ‘For we . . . proclaim the effects of Christ’s passion for
 ‘the well-being of our common life *in the figure of* His body
 ‘and blood,’ (19 16.)

37. AUGUSTINE: ‘Sacraments for the most part *receive the*
 ‘*names even* of the things themselves.’ (21 3.) ‘The apostle
 ‘Paul . . . could yet preach the Lord Jesus *by signifying*

‘Him at one time by his tongue, at another by letter, at another by the sacrament of His body and blood.’ (21 18.) ‘Which body (that of true believers) also the church celebrates in the sacrament of the altar, where, in the same sacrament, *is shown* that in that oblation which the church offers, itself is offered.’ (21 28.) ‘Does Christ die as often as the Passover is celebrated? but yet the yearly memorial *does*, as it were, *represent* what occurred long since, and causes in us such emotions as if we saw the Lord hanging on the cross.’ (21 45.) ‘The same who in their rage had killed Him, being changed, believed in Him; and the blood which in their raging they had shed, *by believing* they drank.’ (21 93.) ‘Many of them believed, and the shedding of the blood of Christ was forgiven them: at first they shed it while they raged, now they drank *while they believed*.’ (21 103.)

38. CHRYSOSTOM: ‘Art thou made a sinner? He is made to thee a Lamb: “Behold, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.” Dost thou wish to eat? He is made to thee a table. Dost thou wish to drink? He is made to thee a cup: “He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.”’ (22 3.) ‘Again, the Scripture is accustomed to *call* both the mysteries [of the Eucharist] and the whole church by the name of flesh, *saying that they are* the body of Christ.’ (22 27.) ‘For as we call the bread, before it is sanctified, bread; but when divine grace has sanctified it, it is set free from the name bread, and thought worthy to *be called* the Lord’s body.’ (22 39.) THEODORET: ‘His body He *calls* a garment, and His blood wine, since the Lord, too, *has called* the mystic wine blood. (23 1.) ‘For He *called* His own body bread.’ (23 20.) ‘Do not we, partaking of the holy mysteries, communicate with the Lord Himself, whose body and blood *we say* they are? For we are all partakers of that one bread.’ (23 27.) ‘The Lord *called* Himself a vine.’ . . . ‘He then *called* the blood of the Saviour the blood of the grape.’ (23 39.) ‘God *entitled* His own body bread;’ and *has named* His flesh wheat.’ ‘He *called* the bread His body and what is mingled, blood.’ ‘That which is His

'body by nature *is* rightly *called* body.' 'Our Saviour 'changed the names, and on His body He *placed* the name of 'the symbol, and on the symbol that of the body; and so '*having named* Himself a vine, He *entitled* the symbol blood; 'For He that *entitled* His body, that is so by nature 'wheat and bread, and again *named* Himself a vine, He 'honoured the visible symbols with the title of body and 'blood.' (23 40.) 'But how dost thou *call* the elements 'after consecration? The body of Christ and the blood of 'Christ.' (23 45.)

39. These extracts serve to illustrate what might be quoted from the Fathers. *All* these men either did believe the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, or they *all* did not believe it. The fact is, that the strength of the argument in favour of the Paschasian doctrine of the real presence is determined by the most unfavourable witness of the whole, supposing there is any difference amongst them, not only so, but the argument is really no stronger than the most unfavourable indirect evidence which could be brought against it from the writings of any one of the Fathers. The doctrine we are disputing is so simple, that if true it must have been looked upon as neither more nor less than a fact, and one too of such an awful, solemn nature, that no orthodox Father could by any possibility, even in the most indirect manner, have said anything which might seem to call it in question without raising a storm of indignant protest. During the first eight hundred years of the Christian era we have no such protest, and not a syllable of controversy on the subject. The above evidence, with very much more of the same kind, which we have already given, makes it appear incredible that if the Fathers really believed the doctrine we are disputing, they 'could have said so much that is absolutely subversive of it.

40. Some of the above citations deserve more than a passing notice. The Roman Catholics and Dr Pusey claim a passage from Tertullian as directly teaching their doctrine on the real presence. As Dr Pusey as well represents the Romanists as himself, it will be sufficient to examine his teaching. The passage from Tertullian, as cited and translated by Dr Pusey

is, 'He hath not, until now, rejected the water of the Creator, wherewith He cleanses His own, nor the oil, wherewith He anoints His own; nor the union of honey and milk, with which He nourishes His infants; nor bread wherewith He maketh present His own very body, even in His own sacraments, needing to be mendicant to the Creator.' (10 8.) Dr Pusey maintains that in these words Tertullian teaches that with bread Christ really makes His own very body present in that element when consecrated. It is maintained, on the contrary, that Tertullian teaches that with consecrated bread in the Eucharist Christ does not really make His own very body present, but represents it. (See 10 8, the latter part.) Dr Pusey, in vindication of his translation, states, 'It ("*represento*") always means "makes present," but this, either to the mind or in act, as the case may be. But in the one class of passages, the very subject itself implies that the object is present; in the other, that it is not. The nature of the "presence," whether it be in act, or to the mind only, is determined by the context, or the subject, not by the force of the word "*represento*." . . . In every place in which the word signifies, "make present to the mind," the very context makes it quite clear that it is so. On the other hand, in all cases in which it is used absolutely, without any limitation from the context, it signifies "make actually present."' (Notes, &c., pp. 81-83.)

41. It remains that the chief of those citations made by Dr Pusey to illustrate both ways in which the word in question is used by Tertullian be now given with more of the context, and translated, beginning first with the instances where Tertullian uses the word 'to make actually present.'

42. 'Every uneducated person who agrees with our opinion will be apt to suppose that the flesh will have to be present (*representandum*) at the judgment. . . . The soul will be sufficiently endowed with the faculty of suffering and sense so as not to require the presence (*representatione*) of the flesh.' (*De Res. Car.* c. 17, p. 321.) 'He sets before us a Judge who is to award both sentences, and has confirmed the presence (*representatione*) of all bodies.' (*Adver. Mar.*, lib. v. c. 12, p. 469.)

43. Instances where it signifies 'to make present to the mind,' or 'to represent.' When the likeness of a god is put 'on the head of an ignominious and infamous wretch, that 'one impure, and trained up for the art in all effeminacy, 'represents (*representat*) a Minerva or a Hercules.' 'When 'he (Cneius Pompeius) had taken Jerusalem, and thereupon 'had gone up to the temple to examine the secrets of the 'Jewish religion, found no image (*simulacrum*), and without 'doubt, if that were worshipped which was by any visible 'image represented (*aliqua effigie representabatur*), it would 'be nowhere more seen than in its own holy place.' (*Apol.* cc. 15, 16, pp. 39, 41.) 'Filthy lewdness which the Atellan 'acteth, which the buffoon representeth through women (*per mulieres representat*.)' 'Yet even now in a certain manner 'we have these things represented through faith, (*per fidem representata*.)' (*De Spec.* cc. 17, 30, pp. 143, 147.) 'Run 'over the apostolic churches in which the very chairs of the 'apostles are still pre-eminent in their places, among which 'are read their very authentic letters, sounding the voice, 'and representing the face of every one, (*representantes faciem uniuscujusque*).' (*De Præscrip.* c. 36, p. 211.) 'But almost all the Psalms which sustain the person of 'Christ represent (*representant*) the Son, speaking to the 'Father, that is, Christ to God.' (*Adver. Præx.* c. 11, p. 499.)

44. Those very instances to which Dr Pusey has referred us, supply a certain rule of interpretation of the citation in question. In the first three extracts we have instances of an immediate and direct presence without the intervention of anything, that is, not a representation, but a real presence. In the other citations we have instances of a mediate and indirect presence, through the medium of something, that is, not a real presence, but one by representation or substitution. Beyond all question, the passage under consideration comes under the latter illustration and not under the former, for it is not a real presence but a presence by representation; certain things being represented to faith, as the writings of the Apostles represented their faces and as certain Psalms represented Christ as speaking to the Father, so bread represents the body of Christ. Tertulian in speaking of material substances used sacramentally, viz.

—the sacramental water and oil of Baptism as understood by the early Fathers, the mixture of milk and honey for the newly baptised, and the sacramental bread of the Lord's Supper. The sacramental bread was no more that which it represented than were sacramental substances of water, oil, and honey and milk that which they severally represented. See the whole passage (10 8.) The word represent is only one of several modes which he uses to express something signified, but not really present (See chapter xi. 56, above.)

45. The next passage we have to notice is a kindred one from Jerome, which is given (18 56,) where the reader will see a translation by Dr Pusey accompanied by another. It is almost certain that the copy from which Dr Pusey has translated, has received some addition to the original, and to that he has yet further added an important phrase in his translation to which there is nothing corresponding in the copy from which he translates. The force and folly of these additions will be best seen by placing them in brackets in a fair translation from the generally accepted text of the original, thus—‘In order ‘that He Himself also might represent [to the Father] [in the ‘verity] the verity of His body and blood in the same manner ‘as Melchizedek, priest of the most High God had done when ‘offering bread and wine in prefiguration of Him.’ It is not possible to make any sense of Jerome's statement either with one or both of the additions. Another translation is given (18 56,) quoted from the translation of the *Catena Aurea* of Thomas Aquinas, edited by Dr Pusey, the Rev. John Keble, and Dr J. H. Newman, with a preface by Dr Newman. The translator has substituted the reading *veritatem* for *in veritate* as given in the above named work, and has translated the words, ‘*Ipse quoque in veritate sui corporis et sanguinis ‘representaret,*’ as follows—‘He also should offer the present ‘verity of His body and blood.’ Error is naturally a very crooked thing, and no amount of crooked ways or practices will make it otherwise. How daring these men must be to take such liberties with the writings of so accomplished a scholar as Jerome, as if he were capable of writing nonsense.

46. The text of Jerome, taken without any additions or alterations, as it is almost universally received, and with a just

translation of the same, no more teaches that Christ in the use of bread and wine made His body and blood present in them than Melchizedek did in the use of the same things. This is confirmed by what Jerome has said elsewhere, 'Melchizedek, even then in type of Christ, offered bread and wine, and consecrated the Christian mystery in the body and blood of Christ' (18 3.) Had Jerome said this of Christ the Paschasians would have considered that here they had a valuable piece of evidence in favour of their doctrine of the real presence. Cyprian gives the same testimony. He says:— 'The Lord Jesus Christ offered that very same thing (*hoc idem quod*), which Melchizedek had offered, that is, bread and wine.' (12 4.) Augustine also plainly says 'That which Melchizedek offered to God, we now see to be offered in the Church of Christ throughout the whole world.' (21 25.) Is it conceivable that if any one of these three illustrious witnesses had had the remotest conception of the notions of Paschasius of the ninth century, or of his disciples of the nineteenth, they could have written or spoken thus?

47. The word 'represent' as used both by Tertullian and Jerome is only one out of many ways in which they and the Fathers generally speak of the consecrated elements as we have shown above (secs. 34-38.) If these Fathers had believed that the consecrated bread was as really whole Christ, God and man, as 'the Word was God,' and that the phrase 'This is my body,' must be understood as literally as 'The Word was God,' as Dr Wiseman maintained (34 18,) and Dr Pusey now maintains (35 69) in his sermon just published (June 1871,) then their mode of speech is unaccountable. They certainly believed no such thing. Is it credible that if Chrysostom had known anything of the faith of these two doctors he could, as we have seen, have said:—'The Scripture is accustomed to call both the mysteries [of the Eucharist] and the whole Church by the name of flesh, saying that they are the body of Christ?' It is really incredible.

48. We have yet the most important witness to examine on this point, and that is Theodoret, one of the greatest commentators of his age, if not of the early Christian Church. He teaches, in one of his most accurate and argumentative

productions, that the consecrated bread of the Eucharist was no more really the body of Christ, than the body of Christ was really bread, or really wheat, and that the consecrated wine was no more really Christ's blood than He was really a vine. He says, 'That God entitled His own body bread, and elsewhere has named His flesh wheat.' (23 40.) He has told us here where Christ named His flesh wheat, and where He entitled His own body bread we learn elsewhere. 'For He called His own body bread. For He said :—'The bread which I will give is my flesh [which I will give] for the life of the world. They affixed this bread to the wood,' &c. (23 20.) Here it would appear that Christ rather says 'the bread is my flesh or body,' than 'my flesh or body is the bread.' But Christ did not give bread for the life of the world. No; He gave His flesh or body which He called bread, and this is what Theodoret understands by the passage. The words in brackets in the above text are rather a commentary than a part of the original text, they not being found in the oldest manuscripts, in only some of the Greek, and probably none of the Latin Fathers. Theodoret says :—'But our Saviour changed the names, and on His body He placed the name of the symbol, and on the symbol that of the body.' That the reader may see the nature of the change effected, each phrase as it stands in St John and in the 'words of institution' shall be given. The following phrase, as it stands in St. John, is given according to the Vatican and Sinaitic texts, and as cited by Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen (11 2, 3,) Eusebius (14 5) Jerome, Gaudentius (19 3,) and Augustine, (21 79.) 'The bread which I will give for the life of the world is my flesh.' In the words of institution: 'This bread is my body which [body] is given for you.' In regard to the former phrase, Theodoret says 'God entitled His own body bread, that is, He did not give bread for the life of the world, but His own flesh or body which he gave was entitled bread.' In regard to the latter phrase Theodoret says :—'On His body He placed the name of the symbol, and on the symbol that of the body,' and 'so having named Himself a Vine, He entitled the symbol 'blood,' (23 40,) that is, that which in the former phrase He called His body, in the latter He called bread, and *vice versa*.

In the one He called His natural body figuratively by the symbol bread, in the other the symbol the natural bread, He figuratively called His body. In St. John He called His own body or flesh a corn of wheat; in the Eucharist He called wheaten bread His own body or flesh. In St John He said: 'I am the Vine;' in the Eucharist, He said: 'This wine is my blood.'

49. Other Fathers, however, do not consider that in John vi. 51, Christ called His flesh bread, but that He called bread His flesh. Clement says: 'He speaks of bread as flesh.' (9 4,) not of the flesh as bread. Augustine also says, 'He called 'bread flesh.' (21 79,) not flesh bread. Here most certainly we have a figure of speech, and one, too, identical with the phrase 'this bread is my body.' Romanists, as we have seen (secs. 2, 10, above,) admit that if Christ meant to say, 'this bread is my body,' He uttered a figure of speech, that He did so mean is the unanimous belief of the Fathers (secs. 11-14), The phrase, 'bread is my flesh,' (John vi. 51,) and the phrase 'bread is my body,' are two figurative phrases which are perfectly analogous. Gaudentius, in an exposition of the rite of the Lord's Supper, actually explains one phrase by the other. He says: 'This is the flesh of the Lamb,' (meaning what is partaken of in the Eucharist.) 'For the Bread which came 'down from heaven saith, "The bread which I will give for "the life of the world is my flesh.'" (19 3.) He further says, 'This is His blood,' (meaning the blood of Christ in the Eucharist,) which he explains as follows:—'Rightly, too, is 'His blood represented by the form of wine, for when He Himself in the gospel saith, "I am the true vine," He sufficiently "declares that all the wine which is offered in the figure of "His passion is His blood.'" (19 3, 4.) Here, to an absolute certainty, Gaudentius teaches that the consecrated wine in the Eucharist was Christ's blood in the same sense and in no other in which Christ in St John's gospel is a vine. For in explaining what the blood of Christ is in the Eucharist, he plainly states: 'For when He Himself saith in the gospel, "I "am the true vine, He sufficiently declares that all the wine 'which is offered in the figure of His passion is His blood.'

50. So far are Theodoret and Gaudentius from having be-

lieved with Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey, that the words, 'This is my body,' must be understood as literally as the words, 'The Word was God,' they believed that the consecrated bread in the Eucharist was no more the real body of Christ than His body was real bread, and that the consecrated wine was no more Christ's blood than He Himself was a vine. Did Dr Pusey feel the inconvenience of the testimony of these two witnesses, and was it on that account that he undertook to destroy it, for that he really did, as may be seen (23 40,) and (19 4,) where the originals are given, and Dr Pusey's translations, accompanied by others, are given in parallel columns. Where Theodoret most certainly says, 'that God 'entitled His own body bread, and elsewhere named His flesh 'wheat,' Dr Pusey makes him say: 'that God hath called 'bread His own body, and contrariwise, He hath called the 'flesh corn.' The delivery of the mysteries, that is, of the consecrated elements, is converted into an institution of them, and where Theodoret plainly says, 'Christ honoured the visible 'symbols with the title of body and blood,' Dr Pusey strangely makes him say that 'He honoured them with the title of bread 'and wine.' With regard to Gaudentius, what he expressed in one sentence as one thought, Dr Pusey makes him express in two sentences as two independent thoughts; and the words which necessarily connect the first part of the sentence with the second, Dr Pusey has replaced by words not showing any necessary connection, and the word wine of the second part of the sentence which is logically connected with the word vine of the first, he has omitted. A more outrageous treatment of an author's sentiments could not well be perpetrated. Chrysostom has employed the very same argument in refutation of the Apollinarian heresy as Theodoret has, and shows that although the consecrated bread is called the body of Christ, yet it is still by nature bread. He says: 'It is set free from the name 'bread, and thought worthy to be called the Lord's body.' (22 39.)

51. The only marked difference between the three phrases in St John's gospel, and the two in the Eucharist is, that the latter are sacramental, the former not so; in the one, there is no visible element employed, in the latter, there are bread

and wine. We are much inclined to think that the sets of phrases as figures of speech are substantially the same. It is certain, as we have already shown, that several of the Fathers (ch. xi. 45-47,) understand the phrases of the Eucharist as if Christ had said: 'My body is this bread;' 'My blood is this 'wine.' Bread and wine mingled with water were the common food of the body, therefore, to represent the happy and substantial effects of Christ sacrificing His living body for us, and shedding His blood for us, as food for the soul under the aspect of food for the body (for the Fathers commonly teach that, as one feeds the body, so the other feeds the soul,) was natural; but for bread and wine to be presented under the aspect of a living body, and its shed blood, as food for the soul, appears incongruous; yet for the bread really to become Christ's living body, and the wine His shed blood, and that these are to be eaten by the natural mouth, as the natural mouth would eat the real flesh of a person, as Dr Wiseman teaches (34 6,) and as his disciple, Dr Pusey, now teaches, (35 71,) is revolting in the extreme.

52. Although Dr Pusey has accepted both Theodoret and Gaudentius as witnesses on the doctrine of the real presence, yet strange to say, the very use which both of them have made of the words, 'I am the true vine,' in relation to the words of institution, Dr Pusey has condemned as a sophism, and so far has made his own chosen witnesses sophists. Dr Pusey says: 'One can then hardly understand how, from 'mouth to mouth, the sophism could be repeated, that because 'our Lord could speak of Himself under a metaphor, "I am "the true vine," &c., therefore when He speaks not of Himself, but says, "this thing," and then declares what that thing 'of which He is speaking is, in words absolutely excluding 'metaphor, "My body which is given for you." (35 70.) He 'tells us, 'In the words of institution, "This is my body," 'there is no mention of any symbol. He does not say, "This "bread is my body," but, "This thing which I give you is "my body.' (35 70.) Here he plainly contradicts what he has distinctly taught elsewhere, viz.—that Christ affirmed of the bread that it was His body (35 36,) and that the consecrated elements are symbols (35 32,) although he had adduced

very ample proofs from the Fathers that such also was their belief; the most striking of all is a passage from Chrysostom (22 39.)

53. But if that which Christ held in His hand was bread no longer, and was not a symbol, figure, &c., but as Dr Pusey says, was something which was His body, and said it was so 'in words absolutely excluding metaphor,' that something must be His body, for if it were another thing, there must be a metaphor. Dr Wiseman, from whom Dr Pusey has copied so much, has said, 'Christ says, "THIS is my body."' The **THIS** 'is nothing but the body; it represents nothing, it means 'nothing, till identified at the close of the sentence with the 'substances named.' (34 19.) We presume this is what Dr Pusey means, and in this view of the case there can be no metaphor in the phrase any more than in the phrase of Christ, 'It is I.' He was that person whom they saw, and that person was He. Dr Pusey, however, says: 'therefore when He speaks 'not of Himself, but says, "this thing, &c."' But if Christ is not speaking of Himself or His body, when he said, 'this is my 'body,' then beyond all question one part of the phrase is a metaphor, as Romanists have argued. The only difference between the phrase, 'Christ is a vine,' and the phrases, 'bread 'is Christ's body,' and 'wine is Christ's blood,' is that in the one case the metaphor is at the end of the phrase, in the other two it is at the beginning.

54. Dr Pusey also says, 'one can hardly understand how 'from mouth to mouth the sophism could be repeated, &c.' (35 70.) As explained by Theodoret, there is nothing hard to be understood; it is surely plain enough. We shall now briefly show how ancient this so-called sophism is; how for many hundred years it has been repeated from mouth to mouth, from author to author, adducing such instances only as happen to occur in our Catena.

55. Clement and other Fathers regarded the wine or 'fruit 'of the vine' in the Eucharist as standing in the same relation to the blood of Christ as He stood in relation to the 'true vine' and that the wine was no more real blood than He was a real vine. Thus Clement, when speaking of the sacramental cup, says, 'Let no one think it strange when we say that the Lord's

'blood is figuratively represented as milk. For is it not figuratively represented as wine?' (9 5.) 'For we know well He too partook of wine, for He, too, was man. And He blessed the wine saying, "Take ye, drink, this is my blood," blood of the vine. He allegorically speaks of the Word who was 'shed for many for the remission of sins.' (9 7.) Origen also says, when speaking of the same cup, 'And the drink is that 'fruit of the true Vine, which saith, "I am the true Vine."' (11 12.) He so explains the words, 'Except ye eat my flesh 'and drink my blood,' as to show that in his judgment the flesh was no more flesh to be eaten than that the blood of the true vine was to be drunk. He says outright, 'We are said to 'drink the blood of Christ, not only in the way of sacraments, 'but also when we receive His words in which is life, as also 'Himself saith, "The words which I speak unto you, they are "spirit and they are life." He therefore Himself has been 'wounded whose blood we drink, that is, we receive the words 'of His doctrine.' (11 34, 35.) Again he says, 'Thou, then, 'art the true people of Israel, which canst drink blood, and 'canst eat the flesh of the Word of God and drink His blood, 'and canst suck up the blood of that grape which is of "the "true vine," and of those branches which the Father purgeth. 'The fruit of those branches is deservedly called the blood of 'those who are wounded, which we drink from their words and 'doctrine.' (11 36.) The reader cannot fail to see from the manner in which Origen speaks of eating the flesh of Christ and sucking up the blood of the true vine, that the one phrase was just as figurative as the other. It should be noted well, too, how carefully Dr Pusey has omitted parts of the homily best calculated to make those parts plain which he has quoted, although they are actually joined thereto.

56. Again, speaking of participating of the consecrated elements, Origen says, 'For we cannot alone and without Him 'either eat of that bread or drink of the fruit of that *true vine*. 'Nor do thou marvel, &c. For God the Word is omnipotent, 'and is called by divers names, and He Himself is innumerable, ' &c.' (11 18.) Again he says, 'We may drink of the fruit of 'this vine. Of what vine? Surely of that of which He Himself was the figure, saying, "I am the vine, ye are the

‘branches.’” Whence again He says, “my blood is drink ‘indeed, and my flesh is meat indeed.’” (11 27.) In the very same homily he condemns a literal interpretation of the words: ‘Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,’ or rather he gives it as an instance, if taken literally, of a letter that killeth, as Augustine subsequently made use of the same passage as an undoubted instance of figurative language. (11 29; 21 13.)

57. Cyprian says, ‘The cup which is offered in remembrance of Christ, should be offered mixed with wine. For whereas Christ says, “I am the true vine,” the blood of Christ is not ‘surely water, but wine.’ (12 2.) Here most certainly Cyprian, an inspired oracle with Dr Pusey, (see chap. viii. 65,) considered that the consecrated wine was no more the real blood of Christ than Christ was a real vine. Here, like other Fathers, he regarded the words of institution in regard to the cup as being a figure of speech in the exact form of the phrase, ‘I am the true vine,’ for he does not here say, ‘wine is the ‘blood of Christ,’ but ‘the blood of Christ is wine.’ Elsewhere, speaking of the words of institution, he says: ‘The Lord calls ‘His body bread,’ ‘He calls His blood wine.’ (12 9.) Did Cyprian, when he uttered these sentiments, perpetrate a sophism? Surely Dr Pusey could not consider Cyprian to have been capable of such a thing, for he believes him to have been an inspired prophet. Of him he says: ‘I do not, of ‘course, deny *Christian* prophecy after the apostolic age, such ‘as I have myself pointed out, as having been vouchsafed to ‘St Cyprian, along the whole course of his episcopate.’ (*On Daniel*, p. 627.) ‘To see one guided by revelations along the ‘whole course of an anxious episcopate.’ . . . ‘Add to this, ‘that He whose “witness” he was, bore witness to him, after ‘death; that he was seen thrice since, in glory: once, as one ‘to whom it had been “given to sit down on the throne” of ‘the Judge, and people might well shrink from judging for ‘themselves of his words, by whom, living, the Holy Spirit ‘spake, and who is now an assessor of their Judge.’ (*Preface to the Translation of Cyprian’s Epistles*, *Oxf. Tr.*, pp. xxi., xxii.)

58. Notwithstanding Dr Pusey’s exalted conception of Cyprian, he has garbled his testimony quite as much as that of any other Father. Thus he has omitted to cite both the

above passages, and has cited, but not in the fairest manner, the words immediately following the first passage, as may be seen. (12 3.)

59. Ambrose bears the same testimony as his brethren, thus, he says: 'Therefore drink the cup, both of the Old and 'New Testament, because thou drinkest Christ in both. Drink 'Christ because He is the vine.' (17 6.)

60. How plainly Gaudentius and Theodoret express themselves on this point has already been noticed in sections 48-50 above.

61. The fact that the Fathers generally, associated the figurative phrase, 'I am the true vine,' with certain phrases in the sixth of St John, and the two phrases of the Eucharist respecting eating the flesh or body of Christ, and drinking His blood became a matter of some importance when, in the ninth century, Paschasius for the first time in the history of the Church, openly maintained that these phrases must be understood literally and not figuratively. Bertram, at the request of his prince, had to answer according to the best of his judgment and knowledge, 'whether the body and blood of 'Christ, which, in the Church, are taken by the mouth of the 'faithful, be made so in a mystery, or in reality.' (25 3.) He says, 'Let us look into the first of these two questions, and 'let us define what figure is, and what reality.' (25 4.) To be brief; Bertram very ably maintains that the phrases, 'This is 'my body,' and 'This is my blood,' are figurative phrases, and not literal ones. He illustrates what he understands by literal phrases, and concludes that the above phrases are not of that kind. He then shows what he understands by figurative phrases which he considers the above phrases to be. Thus he says, 'Figure is a certain outshadowing which exhibiteth what 'it meaneth under some sort of veil; for instance, when we 'would speak of the Word, we say Bread; as in the Lord's 'Prayer, we pray that God would give us our daily Bread. Or 'as Christ in the Gospel saith, "I am the living bread which ' "came down from heaven." "Or when he calleth Himself 'a Vine, and His disciples the branches; saying, "I am the ' "true vine and ye are the branches." All these passages 'express one thing and hint at another.' (25 5.) It is quite

certain that Bertram no more understood Christ to mean that bread was His real body, and wine was His real blood, when He said, 'This bread is my body,' 'This wine is my blood,' than He meant that He was really a vine, when He said, 'I am the true vine.'

62. It is plain, then, that when Dr Pusey would make it appear that to regard the words, 'I am the true vine,' as an analogous figurative phrase to the phrases, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' is a sophism of modern origin, and he 'can hardly understand how, from mouth to mouth it could be repeated,' he must be under some misapprehension more convenient than real, for in fact it is not a sophism, it is not of modern, but of ancient origin, and it is not hard, but easy to be understood. We are sure that these pages testify that Dr Pusey has understood or affected to understand and believe vastly more difficult things.

63. Our next point for examination is the consecration of the elements of bread and wine, or setting them apart from ordinary use to a sacred purpose. This forms a most important part of the present controversy. Modern Romanists, Dr Pusey, and Dr Hamilton, the late Bishop of Salisbury contend that the act of consecration consists in pronouncing the words of institution, viz., 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' and that this is all that is essential to the consecration act; how contrary this is to the general teaching of the Fathers may be seen from a portion of their testimony which here follows. According to the plain teaching of Justin, the act of consecration was the thanksgiving, which was done by the one who presided and his brethren. 'He receiving the bread, water, and wine, sendeth up praise and glory to the Father. . . . and returns thanks at length. . . . Deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread, and wine, and water, over which thanksgiving has been made.' (7 1.) 'When we have done prayer, bread is brought, and wine and water; and he who presides utters prayers and thanksgivings, &c. The food over which thanksgiving has been made.' (7 2.)

64. The only consecration named by Irenæus is that of thanksgiving, 'That bread over which thanks are given.' (8 4.) Clement of Alexandria says, 'But that what was blessed was

'wine.' (9 7.) 'Wherefore the Saviour, taking the bread, 'first spake and blessed.' (9 9.) In the mind of Tertullian, consecration consisted in the act of thanksgiving, for he says, 'Thanksgiving over bread.' (10 9.) Origen, in speaking directly on the consecration of the elements, expresses it after the same manner as the consecration of common food, viz., 'Sanctified by the word of God and prayer.' (11 5.) Again, he says, 'The bread offered with thanksgiving and prayer.' (11 50.) Cyril states, 'For as the bread and wine of the 'Eucharist before the holy invocation of the adorable Trinity 'was simple bread and wine.' After the invocation, bread and wine remained, but being consecrated, they were no longer simple. (15 7.) 'For as the bread of the Eucharist 'after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is mere bread no 'longer.' (15 11.) Basil evidently considered the act of consecration to consist in prayer or invocation, for he says, 'Who 'of the saints, has left to us the words of invocation when the 'bread of the Eucharist is consecrated and the cup of blessing?' (16 7.)

65. Augustine, in an especial explanation of the ritual of the sacrament, shows that the consecration was effected by the act of thanksgiving as performed in common by all the communicants. Thus he says, 'Observe ye the sacrament in its 'order.' (21 126.) 'The bishop or presbyter says, "Let us "give thanks unto our Lord God," for ye lift up your heart, 'and ye attest, saying, "It is meet and right," that we also 'give thanks to him who made us to lift up the heart to our 'Head. Then after the consecration, &c.' (21 127.) Chrysostom expresses the act of consecration by blessing God, or giving thanks to Him; thus he states, 'For these, and for all 'such things, giving thanks, thus we approach. . . . But he 'called it the cup of blessing, because holding it in our hands 'we so proceed to exalt Him in our hymn, wondering, astonished at his unspeakable gift blessing Him, &c. (22 19.)

66. Respecting the 'cup of blessing,' Theophylact remarks, 'That is the cup of thanksgiving, for holding it in our hands, 'we bless Him, and give thanks to Him who shed His blood 'for us.' (*Comment. in I. Epist. ad Cor.* x. 15.) Œcumenius in his commentary on the words 'which we bless,' states,

‘Which holding in our hands, we bless Him who graciously ‘gave His own blood for us, that is, we give thanks.’ (*Comment. in I. Epist. ad Cor.* x. 16.) With Chrysostom as well as with Augustine, the act of thanksgiving performed in common by priest and communicants effected the consecration. He says, ‘The offering of thanksgiving again is common; for ‘neither doth the priest give thanks alone, but also all the ‘people. For having first taken their voices, next when they ‘assent that it is “meet and right so to do,” then he begins ‘the thanksgiving.’ (22 25.)

67. Thus far, as we should expect, according to the teaching of Scripture, the Fathers appear to be unanimous in the opinion that the consecration of the elements was effected by prayer or invocation expressed in blessing or thanksgiving, and not in pronouncing the words of institution. We have the testimony of Jerome yet to examine, which requires a distinct consideration, as the style in which he expresses the act of consecration is capable of being easily misunderstood by those not acquainted with patristic phraseology. Some of these phrases Dr Pusey has adduced in favour of his doctrine of the real presence. Thus Jerome says, 1. ‘With holy mouth ‘presbyters *make* (or consecrate) Christ’s body.’ (18 1.) 2. ‘Presbyter, at whose prayers the body and blood of Christ *are* ‘*made*’ (or consecrated.) (18 14.) 3. ‘A bishop *making* (or ‘consecrating) with holy mouth the flesh of the Lamb.’ (18 15.) 4. ‘Wheat also, whereof heavenly bread *is made*, that ‘is, whereof the Lord speaketh, “My flesh is meat indeed,” ‘and again of wine, “and my blood is drink indeed,”’ (18 25.) 5. ‘Of this wheat *is made* that bread which cometh ‘down from heaven.’ (18 45.) 6. ‘The mind which is about ‘*to make* (consecrate) the body of Christ.’ (18 64.) 7. ‘Corn ‘of which the Lord’s bread *is made*, and wine in which the ‘type of His blood is completed, and oil in which the blessing ‘of sanctification is shown.’ (18 28.) 8. ‘Thinking that the ‘words of invocation *make* (consecrate) the Eucharist, not the ‘life, and that solemn prayer only is necessary, and not the ‘merits of the priest.’ (18 42.) 9. ‘We pollute bread, that ‘is, the body of Christ, when, being unworthy, we approach ‘the altar, and, being impure, drink pure blood.’ ‘On the

'other hand we can say a teacher of the church who *makes* 'spiritual bread, and divides it to the people . . . he 'despises the name of God, and pollutes the bread of doctrines.' (18 47, 48.)

68. The word 'to make' here employed by Jerome in relation to Christ's body and blood is nearly, if not quite, equivalent to the word 'to consecrate,' and Dr Pusey elsewhere has so translated the very word. 'The first sacrament of His 'body and blood *consecrated* by the Lord's hands.' (21 104.) What we have first to ascertain is how Christ's body and blood were made or consecrated. According to the certain teaching of Jerome, this was not effected by pronouncing 'this is my body,' 'this is my blood.' The second and eighth of the above extracts show that in the mind of this most learned Father the consecration was effected by 'prayers,' 'words of invocation,' and 'solemn prayer.'

69. The first six of the above extracts have been cited by Dr Pusey to prove the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated bread and wine, and they are well calculated to impose upon a reader who is not acquainted with the sacramental language of the Fathers. But his fourth and fifth extracts furnish a key of interpretation to his other four. Jerome in the fourth extract speaks of heavenly bread being made of wheat, not of bread being made into Christ's body which was born of Mary, but of sacramental bread being made of wheat, which he calls heavenly, in contrast to common bread, and because he associates the thing signified with the sign. In the context of the passage, as may be seen (18 25), he shows that 'none 'shall eat it save those who praise the Lord,' intimating most plainly that he had no conception of any presence so located in the bread, that whoever received the bread received the presence also. With Jerome there was no necessary connection between the sacramental and heavenly bread, for he distinctly teaches that it may be received in the Holy Scriptures as well as in the sacrament, saying, 'St Paul teaches 'that the spiritual bread of the Church which came down 'from heaven ought not to be injured by Jewish interpretation.' (18 60.) The fifth extract can admit of no other

interpretation than the fourth, and as in that case so in this, the context shows, as may be seen (18 45), that the heavenly bread is spiritual, and can only be received by those who are holy.

70. This interpretation admits of further confirmation from the seventh and ninth extracts not cited by Dr Pusey. In the seventh extract, Jerome, in giving a mystical interpretation to the words corn, wine, and oil of the prophet, as relating to sacramental elements, speaks of oil as being that by which the blessing of sanctification is shown. In the early Church, as for instance in the time of Cyprian, oil was used as one of the two sacraments of Baptism; in more recent times this was separated from Baptism, and became a distinct rite or sacrament called confirmation. When the presbyter at an earlier period, or the bishop at a more recent one, consecrated the oil for the purpose intended, he was not supposed to make the Holy Ghost, though Cyril speaks of the consecrated oil as though it were the Holy Ghost. (see ch. x. 26, 36, 63.) Again, wine is said to complete the type of Christ's blood, not to be made into His blood, though when consecrated it is commonly called by that name. The priest who consecrated the wine no more really consecrated it into Christ's blood than the priest or bishop consecrated oil into the Holy Ghost. We naturally infer then, that although the priest might be said to make or consecrate corn or common bread into the Lord's bread, or His body, he no more really made bread into His body, than the like agency made oil into the Holy Ghost. But Jerome means by the Lord's bread, the sacramental bread or body, not Christ the Bread of life, or His real body, between these two there is an essential distinction, as we learn from Augustine, who says, 'The eleven apostles ate the Bread, the Lord, Judas the Lord's bread against the Lord, they life, he punishment.' (21 99.) We may be perfectly certain that in the above instances, where the presbyter or bishop is said to 'make Christ's body,' or His body and blood are said to be made by his prayers, or with holy mouth to make the flesh of the Lamb or the Lord's bread, Jerome means no more than the consecration of the sacramental bread and the sacramental body or flesh.

71. But the word 'to make' as used by the Fathers in

this connection, proves too much for Dr Pusey's purpose. Thus Jerome himself, in the ninth extract above, speaks of a priest, teacher, or communicant, polluting bread, that is, the body of Christ, by approaching improperly to the Lord's Table, and of a teacher of the Church *making* spiritual bread, and polluting the bread of doctrines. Dr Pusey in his usual way has cited a part of Jerome's teaching, in consequence of which the reader is deceived; whereas, had he cited the whole, he would have been edified and instructed, and certainly would not have been exposed to the danger of being led away by the pernicious Paschasian heresy. Compare 18 47, which Dr Pusey has cited with 48, which he has omitted to cite. Augustine, when speaking of the visible incorporation of believers into the Church or body of Christ, says of them; 'and ye *were made* bread which is the body of Christ.' (21 126.)

72. We learn from Jerome, as well as from the Fathers generally, that the act of consecration was effected by 'prayers,' 'blessing,' 'thanksgiving,' 'words of invocation,' without even a hint of any pronouncement of words. But Dr. Pusey and most of his party make the act of consecration essentially to consist in pronouncing the words of institution, and so do all Roman Catholics. Thus Dr. Pusey says: 'When our Lord 'pronounced the words as the form which consecrates the 'sacramental elements into His body and blood.' (35 5.) Again, 'With the words of consecration, "This is my body," "This is my blood."' (35 67.) Dr. Hamilton says, 'By His 'own words we bless the elements.' (38 7.) The Romanists teach the same thing in their Catechism of the Council of Trent, and other authorized declarations. (38 8, 10.) Some of the Roman doctors rigidly maintain that the bread is wholly and really changed into the body of Christ, by a priest of the apostolical succession, pronouncing with proper intention (which of course can only be known to himself) the Latin words, '*Hoc est enim Corpus meum*,' and so essential is the utterance of these words, that if the priest should by some accident only say, '*Hoc est enim Corpus me*' and leave out the last syllable '*um*' the unaccountable change would not be effected. No wonder that such an act should have been looked

upon as a sort of trick, and the words used in enacting it should in the abbreviated form '*hocus-pocus*' have become expressive of a cheat. This doctrine of consecration has no foundation either in Scripture or early tradition. We probably have in Scripture only one reference to consecration after our Lord instituted the rite, and that is, 'The cup of blessing 'which we bless.' (See ch. vi. 12.) If Dr. Pusey and the Romanists are right, the apostle ought to have said 'The cup 'over which we pronounce, &c.,' and the general testimony of the Fathers, as given above, ought to have been altogether different from what it is. Perhaps it may be said that the cup was blessed or consecrated by the enunciation of the words of institution as Romanists teach, and Dr. Hamilton affirms. (38 7, 8, 10.) To this it is answered that the cup was blessed in no other way than that God was blessed, or thanks were given to Him for it. This is what the Fathers, even some in more modern times, expressly teach. What Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Œcumenius have taught may be seen in section 66 above.

73. What were the words in which our Lord or His apostles blessed, or gave thanks in regard to the bread and wine, we know not, beyond that they really constituted an act of blessing or thanksgiving, and by that act the consecration of the elements was effected. Now, when the notion came into existence that by consecration the elements became, or were converted into the real body and blood of Christ, it was necessary to have some definite and certain form by which so stupendous a change might be supposed to be effected, and it is notorious that since the time of Paschasius, the originator of the doctrine, his disciples have laid their hands on the phrases 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' as the only essential form of consecration, and by which, to use the words of Dr. Pusey, 'the most marvellous of miracles' (35 67.) is effected. It is simply certain that according to Scripture the form of setting apart the elements of bread and wine from a common to a sacred use, was a form of blessing or thanksgiving, and this the Fathers most certainly testify. Hence, the Holy Rite itself is called the Eucharist or Thanksgiving. The *Eulogia* or Blessing, this being an essential part of the Ordinance; but

how, pronouncing the words 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' could be in any proper sense giving thanks to God, or blessing Him it is difficult to conceive.

74. The Greek church, which in its authorized declarations expresses the doctrine of transubstantiation in a more stringent form than that of the Roman Church, believes that invocation and not pronouncing the words of institution affects the consecration, and Dr Pusey tells us that the 'Belief of the Greek Church is the same as ours' on the meaning of the word transubstantiation, and that 'no English Churchman, who believes the real presence as his Church teaches, could hesitate to accept it.' (35. 54, 55.) These outrageous assertions may serve as expressions of his own faith.

75. From the act of consecration we proceed to enquire who are the consecrators. Romanizers, as well as Romanists, connect the act and the actor together, and make it appear that the Lord Jesus Christ Himself is the consecrator. Dr. Hamilton taught this in accordance with the Roman Church. (38 5, 7, 8, 10.) Mr. Shipley says, 'Christ first incarnates Himself in the hands of the priest: that is, at the moment of consecration Christ unites Himself, Body, Soul, and Divinity, in an ineffable manner, with the elements of bread and wine.' (39. 2.) Archdeacon Freeman, in principle a true disciple of Paschasius, has excelled his brethren in the manner in which, by the aid of a powerful and poetic imagination, he has made it appear that Christ Himself, almost without human agency, is the consecrator of the sacramental elements. Thus he says:—

'In all Liturgies, without exception, a strange and perfectly unique phenomenon,—or having a parallel only in the rite of Baptism,—may be discerned at this juncture. Taught, doubtless, by her Lord Himself and His apostles,—[but of which he truly says, 'the New Testament being silent'] so universal is the remarkable feature referred to,—the Church so frames her memorial, by a change in her mode of expression, as to withdraw from the action, as far as may be, her own personality. Hitherto she has poured forth, with bold heart and lavish hand, all manner of direct address and service to God. But now she suddenly ceases from her own words. Struck with awe at a task so transcending all human speech, she stands reverently aside, and, for all sufficient memorial, recites the words and imitates the action of the great High priest when giving Himself for the life of

‘the world. It is His voice, His hand, that she summons to action now. In all churches her own voice is silent, her own hand still. “The Lord is in His holy temple, and all the earth keeps silence “before Him.” . . . The absolute cession and abdication, though but for a brief space, of her own function of prayer, can mean nothing else than this. The elements have *now* become, through her memorial, and the priestly operation of Christ, and sanctification of the Holy Ghost, the body and blood of Christ.’—(*The Principles of Divine Service*, ch. i. 11, vol. ii., pt. 2, pp. 193-195.)

Again he says, ‘The Consecrator is still no other than Christ, ‘presenting effectually, though by the hands of earthly ‘ministers, the gift.’ (*Ibid.*, ch. ii. 11, vol. ii., pp. 363, 364.)

76. It is most important to observe that the Fathers frequently refer to the Person, Christ Jesus, in the Eucharist as Divine and Human, as Jehovah and as Man. The following is an illustration from Theodoret, ‘For He calls the ‘Church His body, and through it, as man, He exercises the ‘Priest’s office, but as God, He receiveth the offerings. But ‘the Church offereth the symbols of His body and blood, ‘hallowing the whole lump through the first fruits.’ (23. 14.) When the Archdeacon says, ‘The consecrator is still no other ‘than Christ presenting effectually, though by the hands of ‘earthly ministers, the gift,’ he doubtless is referring not to Christ as Jehovah, but as man; for it was as man that He took upon Him the office of High Priest, and what He now does in the Eucharist is not done otherwise than spiritually. The Archdeacon has appealed, as we have seen, to tradition—tradition too in a very corrupt form as given in the interpolated Liturgies, for evidence which he confesses is not contained in Scripture. Now, had he either properly controlled his imagination when he looked into the Liturgies, or had he consulted a purer tradition as contained in the writings of the early Fathers, he could not have conceived of Christ’s doing any thing in what is called the communion, apart from His body of believing people. How the Fathers generally speak on this subject we have noticed elsewhere. (Ch. xi, 80-103.) To conceive of Christ in His body as doing any thing in His holy supper apart from His members is plainly contradictory to the undoubted teaching of the Fathers, who uniformly maintain that in that Holy Communion there is Whole Christ, Head

and members, and what is done therein is not done by a part of that ineffable mystical Head and Body, but by the whole. But this is beside the question ; for our present enquiry in regard to the act of consecration and its actors, only extends to what is visible, material, and human ; and in regard to what is invisible, spiritual, and divine, will be considered presently.

77. We cannot omit noticing in passing, that it is most probable that Archdeacon Freeman is wrong in assuming that the act of consecration, by whomsoever effected, causes the elements to become either the body and blood of Christ in the sense he understands, or as understood by his brethren the Ritualists and the Romanists. When he says, 'The elements 'have now become the body and blood of Christ,' he means the mortal remains of Christ, or rather what were those remains, and without His Soul and Divinity. From those remains he withholds worship or adoration. On this point he differs from his brethren to their great grief.

78. This is the most fitting place to notice the testimony of the best of these ancient liturgies, which in truth teach, that the consecrated elements are not really Christ's body and blood, but types thereof. By far the most trustworthy is found in the so-called Apostolical Constitutions. It is generally admitted that the substratum of this production cannot be traced higher than to about A.D. 400, and its numerous fillings up are admitted to be of a much later date. In the ancient liturgies there is much that is common to all, but certain parts of one or two of the most ancient of them, is all that we require. If, as Roman Catholics, Dr Pusey and the entire Paschasian School maintain that their doctrine was unanimously and universally held by the Fathers, and that the words, 'This is my body,' were understood as literally as the phrase, 'The Word was God,' then we may be quite certain that anything either directly or indirectly, either in the liturgies or elsewhere, that might seem to call that doctrine in question, would have raised a storm of controversy, so furious, as in that respect to be second to none in the early Christian church. But for more than 800 years there was no controversy on the subject. If then, we find forms of expression, or single words employed in any of the most ancient liturgies

subversive of such a doctrine we may conclude that at that time it was not a doctrine of the Church. Thus in the Clementine liturgy we have, 'and do thou accept them (our offerings) to the honour of Thy Christ, and send down upon this sacrifice thine Holy Spirit, the Witness of the Lord Jesus' sufferings, that he *may show* (ἀποφῆνῃ) this bread the body of thy Christ, and the cup the blood of thy Christ now we have received the precious body and the precious blood of Christ, let us give thanks to Him, who has thought us worthy to partake of these His holy mysteries We thank thee that thou hast thought us worthy to partake of thy holy mysteries which thou hast bestowed upon us, for the entire confirmation of those things we have rightly known.' (*Cons. Apost.* lib. viii. cc. 12, 14, 15. *Cotelerii*, tom. i. pp., 493, 405.)

79. Is it credible that any one who believes that by consecration, the elements in some miraculous manner became the actual and real body and blood of Christ could frame such an expression as, '*show this bread*, &c.' which is far more consonant with the idea that the consecrated elements represented or signified the body and blood of Christ, than that they were made them. The very first rendering which Stephanus gives of the Greek is '*ostendere*,' to show. How Tertullian, Cyprian, and Jerome use that word in a similar connection may be seen 10 14; 12 3, 6, 7; 18 28; where it is certain it can neither teach nor imply the real presence of that which is shown or represented. It is only one of many ways in which the Fathers express themselves in regard to the use of the consecrated elements as we have stated above (Secs. 34-38.), none of which imply the real presence of that which is 'shown,' 'represented,' 'called,' 'named,' 'understood,' 'made,' 'transfigured,' 'entitled,' and which 'appears,' 'becomes,' &c., &c. Irenæus uses nearly the same form of expression but calls the bread and the wine which exhibited or showed the body and blood of Christ, antitypes. He says, 'We invoke the Holy Spirit, that He may exhibit this sacrifice, both the bread the body of Christ, and the cup the blood of Christ, that they who receive these antitypes may obtain forgiveness of sins, and eternal life.' (8 8.) That the word

‘to show,’ or ‘exhibit’ in that connection cannot teach or imply a real presence, is confirmed by other proofs, viz., that the elements which are called body and blood are afterwards, in the case of Irenæus, called antitypes of them, and in the Clementine liturgy are described in two instances as mysteries, and in the latter instance it is unquestionably implied that the mysteries are pledges or seals, for it is said, ‘We thank Thee that thou hast thought us worthy to partake of thy holy mysteries, which thou hast bestowed upon us for the entire confirmation of those things we have rightly known.’ But pledges are not the things of which they are the pledges, nor are mysteries really the things which they mystically or sacramentally signify or represent, of which we have already given abundant proof in chapter ix. But this also admits of undoubted confirmation from other parts of these so called constitutions of the apostles. Thus it is stated: ‘And when He had delivered to us the antitypical mysteries (ἀντίτυπα μυστήρια) of His precious body and blood.’ (*Ibid.*, lib. v., c. 14, tom. i., p. 317.) ‘Instead of a bloody sacrifice, He has appointed that a reasonable and unbloody mystical one, which is for the death of the Lord, by means of the symbols of His body and blood.’ (*Ibid.*, lib. vi., c. 23, tom. i., p. 353.) ‘And offer ye the acceptable Eucharist, the representation (antitype, ἀντίτυπον) of the royal body of Christ.’ (*Ibid.*, lib. vi. c. 30, tom. i., p. 358.) We also, our Father, thank Thee for the precious blood of Jesus Christ, which was shed for us, and for His precious body, these representations (antitypes ἀντίτυπα παύσα) of which we celebrate, as himself appointed us to shew forth His death. (1 Cor. xi. 26.) For through Him glory is to be given to Thee for ever, Amen.’ (*Ibid.*, lib. viii., tom. i., p. 370.) Nothing could be more fatal to the Romish doctrine of the real presence.

80. In regard to another leading liturgy, Brett in his treatise on liturgies, so far as they relate to the Eucharist, says, ‘In the Constantinopolitan Liturgy that goes under the name of S. Basil, after the words of institution are pronounced, by which words alone the Church of Rome pretends that change is made, the gifts are called the antitypes of the holy body and blood of Christ, which Goar, though a Romanist,

' translates, "the representatives of the body and blood of ' "Christ." ' (pp. 317, 318.) In the time of Ambrose the following formed part of the Communion service, 'Let this ' oblation be ascribed valid, reasonable, because it is a figure ' of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.' (17 16.) From a Liturgy in common use in the Latin Church in the ninth century, Bertram cited strong evidence in refutation of the heresy of Paschasius. (25 50-54.) Cyril, in his exposition of the liturgy of his day to the newly baptized, makes this statement, 'We are bidden to taste not bread and wine, but ' the *antitype* of the body and blood of Christ.' (15 15.) For more evidence upon this point the reader may consult Augustine 21 126, 127, 136, 137; Fulgentius, 21 131-134, 138; Bede, 24 26, 27; Bertram, 25 58-61; Rabanus Maurus, 26 19-27; and Ælfric, 27 16.

81. Roman Catholics, to prove that Christ Himself consecrates with His own words, 'This is my body,' lay their hands on the following passage from Chrysostom :

' Christ is present now too. The same who adorned that table, ' adorneth this too now. For it is not man who makes what lies there ' to become the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself who was ' crucified for us. The priest stands, filling up a figure, speaking those ' sayings, (τὰ ῥήματα ἐκείνα) the power and the grace are of God. "This is my body," He saith. This saying (τοῦτο, τὸ ῥημα) re- ' ordereth what is there, and as that voice, "increase and multiply and "replenish the earth," was spoken once, but throughout all time in ' effect giveth power to our race to the procreation of children, so also ' that voice once spoken doth on every table in the Churches from ' that time even till now, and unto His coming, complete the sacrifice.' —(*De Prodit.*, Sermon xxx., tom. v., p. 463.)

Another passage which they adduce for the same purpose is, 'The works set before us are not of man's power, He that then ' did these things at that Supper, this same now also works ' them. We occupy the place of servants. He who sancti- ' fieth and changeth them is the same. . . . This table is ' the same as that, and hath nothing less. For it is not so ' that Christ wrought that, and man this, but He doth this ' too. This is that upper chamber, where they were then.' (22 9.)

82. This is the most plausible piece of evidence that Romanists and Romanizers can adduce in proof of Christ's

consecrating the elements with His own words. But it is really beside the question, not relating to what is visible and human, but to what is invisible and divine, not to the human instrument of consecration, but to its Divine author, by whose authority and grace it is effected. We shall, however, better appreciate Chrysostom's teaching by citing two other kindred passages. One relating both to the Sacrament of Baptism and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; the other relating to the rite of ordination. He says,—

‘For what if thou hear no voice? yet thou seest Him laid out; or, rather thou dost also hear His voice, while He is speaking by the Evangelists. Believe, therefore, that even now it is that Supper, at which He Himself sat down. For this is in no respect different from that. For, neither doth man make this and Himself the other; but both this and that is His own work. When therefore thou seest the priest delivering it unto thee, account not that it is the priest that doeth so, but that it is Christ's hand that is stretched out. Even as when he baptizes, he doth not baptize thee, but it is God that possesses thy head with invisible power, and neither angel, nor archangel, nor any other dare draw nigh and touch thee: even so now also. For when God begets, the gift is His only. Seest thou not those who adopt to themselves sons here, how they commit not the act to slaves, but are themselves present at the judgment-seat? Even so neither hath God committed his gifts to angels, but Himself is present commanding and saying, “Call no man Father on earth.”’ (22 5.)

In regard to the rite of ordination he says, ‘They were ordained with prayer, for that is the meaning of ordination, that is, putting forth the hand; the hand of the man is laid upon the person, but the whole work is of God, and it is His hand which toucheth the head of the one ordained, if he be duly ordained.’ (*Expos. Acta Apost.*, hom. xiv., tom. viii., p. 545.) In these instances Chrysostom is referring more especially to what is divine and spiritual in Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Ordination, but our inquiry has regard to what is visible, material, and human. That bread and wine by Christ's institution should become representatives and memorials of things spiritual and invisible, and after the manner of the signs of His Holy Word should aid our faith, or be its medium whereby we may be the happy partakers of the blessings signified or represented by them, must be acknowledged to be a blessed fact. But, to use the sentiments

of Augustine the signs which signify His word are durable, but sacramental signs made for the purpose of signifying His body and blood being consumed, are transient, (21 19,) and require reproduction, and herein differ from the signs of the Word of God, which are permanent. By what human instrumentality are those signs produced? for that is really the question. Now Romanists confound what is seen with what is unseen, spiritual with what is material, and what is human with what is divine, and in their solicitude to have an adequate cause to effect a thing so stupendous as making ordinary bread and wine into Christ's real body and blood, and also the sacrifice of these to be a continuation or repetition of what was done at the first by a high-priestly act, they would make Christ the actual and instrumental Consecrator and Sacrificer, whereas the evidence adduced proves no such thing. No one pretends that Christ baptizes and ordains instrumentally, no one ought to pretend that He administers the Lord's Supper, or consecrates the elements instrumentally. These rites are of His institution, and, if performed according to His will, are as if He Himself performed them. This is especially the case with the Lord's Supper. Chrysostom most plainly and impressively teaches that Christ once instituted His Supper, which should be in force until His second coming, as He, in the opinion of the Fathers, once said 'increase and multiply and replenish the earth' is effectual through all time. Romanists would feign persuade themselves and others that, because Chrysostom says in the first of the above extracts, 'the priest stands 'filling up a figure speaking those sayings,' he necessarily meant the words of institution, and that pronouncing these was the essential part of the consecration. But to this there are two objections which are fatal to the inference. Chrysostom could not refer to that which came after as 'those,' and that which does come after is not sayings, but saying, and Christ is said to utter 'this saying,' as also His voice is said to utter 'Be fruitful and multiply, &c.' In the latter case He instituted once, and once for all coming time, the increase of the human species by saying, 'Be fruitful and multiply, &c.' In the former case too, He instituted his Holy Supper once, and once for all until His coming again by 'this saying,'

'This is my body,' and hence it is called the words of institution. By 'this saying' Chrysostom doubtless meant the words of institution, by 'those words,' he as certainly meant the words commonly used in the act of consecration, and well known to the initiated.

83. Chrysostom plainly teaches that the rites which Christ instituted when subsequently performed in accordance with His will are in no respect inferior to the first. He no more teaches that Christ actually and personally presides at the Lord's Supper than that every place in the world where the Eucharist is celebrated is actually and identically the upper chamber in which our blessed Lord instituted and first celebrated it with His apostles. His idea is, that what Christ commanded to be done, when done, is the same as if He Himself did it, as at the institution and first celebration. Was Christ present then? 'He is present now.' Did He adorn that table? 'He adorneth this now.' 'He that did 'these things at that supper, this same now also works them.' 'This table is the same as that, and hath nothing less.' 'This 'is that upper chamber where they were then.' (22 9.) 'Believe 'therefore, that even now it is that supper at which He Himself 'sat down.' It is Christ's hand that is stretched out,' not the priest's. 'Even as when the priest baptizes, he doth 'not baptize thee, but it is God.' (22 5.) 'The hand of man 'is laid upon the person, . . . and it is the hand of God 'which toucheth the head of the one ordained, if he be duly 'ordained.' It is not necessary to remark that this striking and impressive manner of speaking, as employed by Chrysostom, is not intended to ignore human agency, either in the sacrament of Baptism, the sacrament of Eucharist, or the rite of ordination, and if not, we cannot see what help Romanists and Romanizers can get therefrom in defence of their doctrine. But so far from ignoring human agency they rigidly maintain that unless the consecration of the elements be performed by one who by ordination has received the power of sacrificing from the Apostles there can be no valid consecration, and no Lord's supper. This is what we maintain is contrary to the teaching of the early Church.

84. We shall now show that the act of consecration, accord-

ing to the teaching of the Fathers was the act of all the communicants, and not exclusively the prerogative of any special order of clergymen. We learn this very distinctly from Justin, who teaches that the consecration was effected by thanksgiving, which was done through one who presided, and to which act he says, 'the whole people express their assent ;' 'the people having assented,' (7 1, 2.) Speaking as a layman he states, 'the bread which our Christ gave us to do in remembrance, . . . and the cup which He gave us to do in remembrance of His own blood with giving of thanks.' (7 3.) Elsewhere representing the celebration of the Lord's Supper in sacrificial language, he includes all the communicants as sacrificers. Thus speaking of himself as a layman and of Christians generally, he says, 'We are the true high-priestly race of God, as even God Himself bears witness, &c.' 'Now God receives sacrifices from no one, except through His priests. Therefore anticipating all the sacrifices which we do through this name, . . . you assert that God . . . is pleased with the prayers of the individuals of that nation then dispersed, and calls their prayers sacrifices. Now that prayers and giving of thanks, when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God, I also admit. For such alone Christians have undertaken to do.' (7 4, 5.) This is the earliest and most important testimony of antiquity respecting the ritual of the Lord's Supper, and it is fully confirmed by subsequent witnesses. But before adducing these it will be more convenient to ascertain what is commonly brought forward in more modern times to prove that the essential part of the consecration is effected by a particular order of men, to whom has been committed special powers, and without the exercise of those powers by one duly entrusted with them there can be no consecration, and consequently no valid Eucharist. Roman Catholics, Ritualists, and High Anglicans, alike maintain this view. Dr Moberly, Bishop of Salisbury, an avowed believer in the doctrine of the real objective presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, with apparently very great confidence and certainty maintains that

'In order to constitute its complete character according to the di-

‘vine pattern of its institution, it absolutely requires two things. First, there must be the consecration of the elements by the priest, the organ of the priestly Church, empowered by sacred ordinance to do that solemn and indispensable portion of the joint act which none else may presume to exercise or intrude upon. For it is no common nor ordinary work which he has to do. It is no light thing that by the acts that he organically does, and the words which he organically utters, the spiritual presence of the Lord is so brought down upon the elements of bread and wine as that to the faithful they become verily and indeed, however invisibly and mysteriously, the body and blood of Christ. Through him, in this great priestly work, the whole spiritual life and force which is in the priestly Church, operates as in its highest function. It is only through the sacred gift that is in him by the laying on of apostolic hands, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, that he may venture or presume to do it. This is assuredly the first thing. While the Church, in respect of Holy Baptism, has recognised the fact that though for purposes of honour and order it is right to confine the ordinary and authorised administration of the sacrament to the clergy, yet the gift is not so exclusively in their hands as not to be imparted in any degree by lay people in her communion, or even, if the sacred words and the water are used, by the hands of those who are outside of her communion altogether, there has never been a question of the absolute confinement of the power of consecrating the bread and wine to their mysterious efficacy of becoming to the faithful and to the Church of the faithful the body and blood of the Lord, to the ordained clergy. When I say there has never been a question on this point, I must be understood to mean among Church writers, and in the Church—from St Ignatius to St Bernard, from St Bernard to the days in which the tyranny of perfected sacerdotalism produced its unhappy, but not unnatural effect in the disowning of all divine descent of special priesthood in the Church together. It is needless to quote passages. It is the absolutely universal doctrine of Church writers of every age that to the priesthood alone belongs the power of consecrating the elements to become to the faithful the body and blood of Christ. They have been made by personal authorization and empowerment, the only capable organs for this purpose of the priestliness which, as I have repeatedly said, inheres ultimately in the whole priestly Church, which is priestly as being the body of the One and only Priest, our Lord Jesus Christ.’—(*The Administration of the Holy Spirit in the body of Christ*, pp. 168-170.)

85 This is a most unfortunate utterance, for it is simply untrue from first to last. The very same authority on which he properly considers that the right of baptizing, though by right inherent in Christian laymen for the purposes of honour and order was confined to the clergy (or rather to the bishops, for that is the word which he ought to have used, as

we shall show presently) maintains the very same thing respecting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, viz., that every Christian layman has an inherent right to administer it, but by a human arrangement it was restricted to the clergy. The authority in question is Tertullian, and his testimony in regard to the right of administering baptism is introduced by the bishop as follows :

'There is sufficient evidence to show that the early Church did not regard the power of baptizing in the bishop, and by his commission, as a matter of necessary doctrine, but as one of ecclesiastical order and propriety, according to the words of Tertullian ; "The right of giving Baptism belongs to the chief priest, that is, the bishop ; then to the priests and deacons, yet not without the authority of the bishop, on account of the honour of the Church ; for when that is safe, peace is safe." That laymen were not authorized to baptize is quite clear, for there are express prohibitions of such practice to be found. But, on the other hand, besides that express prohibitions are some evidence of a claim actual or possible, it is also clear that the ground of such prohibition lay not in the doctrine, but in the ecclesiastical discipline of the Church. This is plain from the sequel of the just quoted passage of Tertullian, "for otherwise," he says, "laymen also have the right of baptizing. For what is equally received may equally be given. Likewise baptism, equally regarded as of God can be administered by all ; but how much more is the discipline of modesty incumbent on laymen, since these things belong to their superiors, not to usurp the duty of the episcopal office reserved to bishops."—*Ibid.* pp. 132, 133.

The passage in a connected form, as cited from the writings of Tertullian, is given, (10 3.) From this, and also from what the bishop has cited, the argument of Tertullian just as much applies to the administration of the Lord's Supper as it does to Baptism. Tertullian's argument, as given by Bishop Moberly, is—"Laymen also have the right of baptizing. For what is equally received may equally be given. Likewise Baptism, equally regarded as of God, can be administered by all." We have only to apply the argument to the Eucharist thus, the Eucharist is equally received, and therefore can be equally given. Likewise the Eucharist, equally regarded as of God, can be administered by all ; and we have the true sentiments of Tertullian and of early antiquity, and if, in the above extract from the Bishop, the Eucharist is substituted

for Baptism, what he has said would be just as true of the former as of the latter. We have still more direct evidence to adduce from Tertullian as given **10 17**, where he maintains, on the authority of Holy Scripture, that all laymen are priests, and he made this the basis of an important argument to prove that whatever in regard to discipline is required of the clergy should be required of the laity also. He affirms too that the distinction between a clergyman and a layman, as it existed in his time, was established by the authority of the Church, and in places where that order of things was not established, Christian laymen both baptized and administered the Lord's Supper, and were priests alone to themselves. Nor were these sentiments of Tertullian unknown to the Bishop, for he apparently cites them with approval, together with the passage relating to Baptism (a translation of which is given **10 3**), to prove 'the inherent power of lay-people.' The extract translated is as follows,

'Are not even we laymen priests? It is written: "A kingdom also, "and priests to His God and Father, hath He made us." It is the 'authority of the Church, and the honour which has acquired sanctity 'through the joint session of the Order, which has established the 'difference between the order and the laity. Accordingly, where 'there is no joint session of the ecclesiastical order, you offer, [ad- 'minister the Lord's Supper,] and baptize, and are priest alone for 'yourself. But where three are, a church is, albeit they be laymen.' —*Note Y*, p. 295.

The passage, with much more of the context, is given. (**10 17**.) The Bishop's statement then respecting the exclusive power of the priest in regard to the consecration or administration of the Lord's Supper, is flatly contradicted, not only by His own chosen witness, but by the very two passages which He has cited with approval to prove 'the inherent power of lay-people.'

86. It is plain from both of these passages that Tertullian regarded the particular distinction between the clergy and laity as being of post-apostolic origin and of human arrangement. Hilary the deacon, in his excellent commentary on St Paul's epistles, gives a similar account of the origin of the clerical office, thus he says, 'That the people might increase 'and be multiplied, in the beginning it was permitted to

‘every one to preach the gospel, to baptize, and to expound the Scriptures in the Church; but when the Church embraced all places, there were certain places of assembly appointed, governors and other officers ordained in the churches, so that no one of the clergy who was not ordained would dare to take upon himself an office which he knew was not entrusted or conceded to him. And the Church began to be governed by another order.’ (*Comment. in Epist. ad Ephe., Opera Ambrosii*, tom. iii. col. 504).

87. When bishops ceased to be congregational, village, or small town bishops, and became more like what they are at the present day, they relinquished one part of the rite of baptism, but retained confirmation, which, according to the earliest Fathers, originally was one of the two sacraments of baptism. (See ch. viii. 67; ix. 103.) Jerome, speaking upon this subject much after the same manner of Tertullian, says, ‘In many places, this [the restriction of confirmation to the bishop] was done rather for the honour of the chief priesthood, than for an absolute necessity of the thing. . . . Hence it arises that without the chrism, and without the injunction of the bishop, neither the presbyter nor the deacon has a right to baptize. Which frequently, if necessity urges, we know it is also lawful to laymen; for as any one receives, so also can he give.’ (189.) Dr Pusey himself very properly admits that both this argument and that of Tertullian, which is like it, ‘would equally justify Presbyterian ordination,’ as it does baptism by laymen. (*Preface to the Writings of Tertullian*, pp. xv., xvi.) Who can doubt that it equally justifies the administration of the Lord’s Supper by laymen as a matter of inherent right, but not of constituted order.

88. Augustine appears to have held the same sentiments as Tertullian and Jerome, and moreover shows that they were commonly held in his day. Gratian gives an extract from an epistle of Augustine to Fortunatus, which is as follows: ‘We are accustomed to hear that even laymen are wont to give a sacrament which they have received.’ (*Corpus Juris Canonici*, pars 3 de consecr. dist. 4 c. 21.)

89. We have already seen, according to the teaching of

the Fathers, that the act of consecration consisted in giving thanks to God or blessing Him, but this has ever been considered to be a congregational act. Augustine, as a specimen of the rest, states, in explaining the order of the sacrament, 'The bishop or presbyter who offers says, "Let us "give thanks unto our Lord God," for ye lift up your heart : and ye attest, saying, "It is meet and right" that we also 'give thanks to Him who made us to lift up the heart to our 'Head. Then after the consecration, &c.' (21 127.) Chrysostom even yet states more distinctly the same thing. When addressing the communicants, he said, 'There were 'occasions in which there was no difference at all between the 'priest and those under him ; for instance, when we are to 'partake of the awful mysteries. . . . For in the most 'awful mysteries themselves the priest prays for the people, 'and the people pray for the priest, for the words "with thy 'spirit," are nothing else than this. The offering of thanksgiving again is common to all, for neither doth he give 'thanks alone, but also all the people. For having first 'taken their voices, next when they assent that it is "meet ' "and right so to do," then he begins the thanksgiving.' He concludes by remarking, 'Now I have said this in order 'that each one of the laity also may keep their attention 'awake, that we may understand that we are all one body, 'having such differences amongst ourselves as members with 'members.' (22 25.)

90. Gaudentius in addressing the newly baptised evidently considered them as sacrificers and consecrators in the rite of the Lord's Supper, for he says, 'One died for all : and the 'same being sacrificed in the mystery of bread and wine at 'every communion, refresheth ; being believed, quickeneth ; 'being consecrated, sanctifieth, the consecrators.' (19 3.) That Gaudentius here included the communicants as sacrificers and consecrators admits of confirmation by Bernard, the most valuable Christian author of the eleventh century ; at least we find the following ascribed to him in his writings : 'Dearest brethren, such ought we to be who consecrate the 'body of Christ, when we sacrifice, eating it after consecration. ' . . . Nor indeed ought we to believe that the above-

‘ mentioned virtues are necessary to the priest only as though he
 ‘ alone consecrates and sacrifices the body of Christ. He doth not
 ‘ sacrifice alone ; he doth not consecrate alone. But the whole
 ‘ congregation of the faithful which standeth by consecrateth
 ‘ with Him, sacrificeth along with Him. Nor doth the carpenter
 ‘ alone build the house ; but one brings laths, another timber,
 ‘ another beams, and other things to the work. The bystanders
 ‘ therefore are bound to contribute somewhat of their own as
 ‘ the priest also doth, firm faith, pure prayers, pious devotion.’
 (*Sermo in die Pun.*, tom. ii. f. 257).

91. We have yet another citation to make from Chrysostom, who says, ‘ I am about to say what may appear
 ‘ strange, but be not astonished nor startled at it. The offer-
 ‘ ing is the same, whether a common man or Paul or Peter
 ‘ offer it.’ (22 31.) The question is, What does he mean by
 a common man ? Does he mean a Christian layman or a
 bishop or presbyter ? The *Church Review*, an organ of the
 Ritualists, maintains the latter view. The author of ‘ Whose
 are the Fathers ?’ &c., in that work had cited the same
 passage from Chrysostom to prove that the sacrament of the
 Lord’s Supper, administered by a Christian layman, would be
 a valid sacrament. A reviewer in the above named periodical
 ‘ said, A string of quotations from the Fathers then follows, the
 ‘ object of which is to prove that they held that there was no
 ‘ distinction between a priest and a layman—that there was
 ‘ nothing which a priest did that a layman might not do.
 ‘ In this list of passages we find one quotation so flagrantly
 ‘ and notoriously dishonest, that we cannot allow it to pass
 ‘ without notice. “ Chrysostom confirms this view of the
 ‘ “ case. The offering (the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper)
 ‘ “ is the same whether a common man or Paul or Peter offer
 ‘ “ it.” (p. 75.) The inference naturally would be from this,
 ‘ that St Chrysostom allowed any “ common man,” to offer
 ‘ the holy sacrifice, whereas the “ common man” means any
 ‘ one PRIEST. “ It is the same,” he says, “ which Christ gave
 ‘ “ to His disciples, and which the *priests* now minister.”’
 (*April 27, 1867.*) It is denied that it is to be inferred from
 what Chrysostom has said that *he would allow* any common
 man to administer the Lord’s Supper. This was not *allowed*

as according to order in the time of Tertullian, 200 years before. But what if any Christian layman did administer that holy ordinance contrary to rule and order it is maintained that according to the teaching both of Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom, the ordinance itself so administered would nevertheless be the Lord's Supper.

92. Romanists, Ritualists, and High Anglicans, rigidly maintain that there can be no valid administration of the sacrament, except by one who is of the apostolical succession. Dr Pusey says, 'The doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice depends upon the real objective presence. Where there is the apostolical succession and a consecration in our Lord's words, there it is held by the Roman authorities too.' (35 56.) The theory, however, of apostolical succession, as held by Romanists and High Anglicans, is altogether different. The High Anglicans rigidly hold that every duly consecrated bishop is by that act invested with the apostleship of the twelve; the Romanists hold no such thing, but by ordination only, the priesthood of the apostles, that is the power of sacrificing Christ's body and blood, is handed down. High Anglicans admit also that this is handed down. Dr Hamilton states, 'I maintain that there were those in the first days of the Gospel, who had received in a very special and peculiar way from the one Priest, special powers of sacrificing. The powers committed to the apostles were transmitted by the apostles in the name and place of their Lord to other men.' (38 1.) This is the exact doctrine of Roman Catholics as may be seen. (38 2.) The *Church Review* agrees with the Roman view of apostolical succession, and not with the High Anglican. The author of 'Whose are the Fathers?' also published a treatise on 'The Primitive Mode of making Bishops,' in which he proved that apostolical succession, as held by High Anglicans, was not taught by the Fathers. A reviewer in the *Church Review* admits this, and says, 'Mr Harrison sees that neither election nor confirmation, according to Roman Catholic canons, is used in making English bishops, and that they therefore rest the whole weight of their claim to authority on their consecration by apostolical succession. . . . But this is a claim peculiar to

‘High Anglicans, and unknown to primitive Christianity. . . .
 ‘Consecration by apostolical succession gives the sacramental
 ‘character of priesthood, and in the case of a bishop being
 ‘made, it confers high priesthood.’ (*August 27, 1870.*)
 Romanists, Ritualists, and High Anglicans, alike maintain
 that their notions of apostolical succession were believed every-
 where, always, and by all, Chrysostom not excepted. In the
 face of such a belief, how could they conceive that he would
 call a priest, whether bishop or presbyter, *a common man*,
 and tell the communicants that he was about to say some-
 thing strange, and caution them not to be astonished nor
 startled at it, viz., that the Lord’s Supper administered by a
 man who had been invested with the apostleship of Peter and
 Paul, or, at the very least, with their priesthood, would be
 the same as if Peter or Paul administered it. It has yet to
 be proved that Chrysostom, or any other Father, held either
 Roman or High Anglican views of apostolical succession. He
 certainly had a very exalted conception of the office of a
 bishop and presbyter, and we think it impossible that he
 could call either one or the other a common man. If we allow
 Chrysostom to interpret what he means by ‘a common man,’
 we shall come to the certain conclusion that he denotes, as
 we should say, one not in orders, that is, neither bishop nor
 presbyter. Speaking of the apostles not as specially called
 and divinely qualified by Christ, but in the relation in which
 they stood to the constituted authorities of the Jewish Church,
 as unlearned and ignorant men, or rather as men not then
 ranked among the learned, and not in any public office, but
 in private life, Chrysostom says, ‘For they (their disciples)
 ‘did not despise the apostles as common men (*ὡς τῶν τοῦχόντων*
 ‘*καταφρόνου*), nor did they fix their regard upon that which is
 ‘visible merely.’ (*In Acta Apos.*, hom. vii., tom. viii.,
 p. 499.)

93. To come back to Bishop Moberly. What he correctly
 affirms of the administration of baptism, and very incorrectly
 denies of the administration of the Eucharist may, according
 not only to the teaching of Tertullian and Jerome, but also
 according to that of Chrysostom, be affirmed of the admini-
 stration of the Eucharist. Expressed in the Bishop’s words,

it would stand thus. There is sufficient evidence to 'show 'that the early Church did not regard the power of' administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper 'in the bishop, 'and by his commission, as a matter of necessary doctrine, 'but as one of ecclesiastical order and propriety, according to 'the words of Tertullian,' Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom.

94. Bishop Hamilton, the immediate predecessor of the present bishop, Dr Moberly, maintained that the celebrant, if in the apostolic succession, and otherwise properly qualified, performs a high priestly office. Thus he says, 'They who in 'obedience to His charge, "Do this in remembrance of me," 'do thus act as priests, and exhibit in their celebrations of 'the Eucharist . . . their delegation to the duties and the 'dignities and the ministrations of the priesthood of Jesus 'Christ.' (38 5.) Archdeacon Freeman also teaches that 'The act of consecration is left to the High Priest Himself,' and that 'The Consecrator is still no other than Christ, pre-'senting effectually, though by the hand of earthly ministers, 'the gift.' (*Principles of Divine Service*, vol. ii., pt. ii., pp. 363-65.)

95. This doctrine respecting Christ's being still a sacrificing priest, is the common doctrine of Roman Catholics. To this it is answered that Christ, according to the teaching of the Fathers, has ceased to be a sacrificer, and therefore in that capacity can have no representatives. Rabanus Maurus, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, has not only well expressed his own views, but also those of the early Fathers generally. On the phrase, 'For this He did once 'when he offered up Himself' (Heb. vii. 27,) he remarks, 'When thou hearest that Christ is a high priest, do not think 'that He is always performing the office of high priest. He 'certainly has been once constituted in the high priesthood, 'henceforth He hath sat down; and lest thou shouldest sup-'pose that He stands and is a minister again, whence the 'apostle shows that the duty of the office hath been finished. ' . . . For as He was made a Servant, so also He was made 'a high priest and minister. For it is not the duty of a 'minister to sit down, but to stand.' (26 14.) As to how Chrysostom, Œcumenius, and Theophylact spoke on this sub-

ject (see chapter vi. 25-27). The undoubted teaching of these Fathers forbids the very idea of Christ acting as a sacrificing high priest, and to pretend that he has any sacrificial successors is presumptuous in the extreme.

96. Both Romanists and Ritualists maintain that at every celebration of the Eucharist there is a continuation or repetition of Christ's sacrifice. How contrary this also is to Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers has already been shown in other parts of this volume, more especially in chapter vi. 28-30. Although both Romanists and Ritualists zealously maintain that Christ is the only Consecrator of the sacramental elements, yet they strenuously contend for an exclusive priestly order of men, through whom He consecrates; and that without one of this order there can be no valid sacrament, and that He constituted this order in His apostles and their successors when He said 'Do this in remembrance of me.' How contrary this is to the Holy Scripture and the general teaching of the Fathers has already been shown in chapter vi. 9-18, more especially from the fact that according to both sources of appeal, the words 'Do this' are alike applicable to all Christians, and are not exclusively confined to any particular class.

97. One very important point for consideration is the effect of consecration in regard to the elements. That common bread and wine, by consecration, could be made the medium through which faith might more fully realise certain definite objects of infinite moment, and thus stand in the same relation as the revealed Word of God, was a reality respecting which the Fathers felt strongly, and often spoke in their loftiest style. Moreover, the consecrated elements were, in the judgment of the Fathers, tokens of things past as well as pledges of things to come, to every devout communicant, and were especially instituted by Christ to be the medium of special fellowship of believers with one another and with their Divine Head. The consecrated symbols were regarded as being most sacred, and were even venerated. Thus, Theodoret says, 'The symbols are believed, and are venerated 'as if they were those things which they are believed to be.' (23 45.); and elsewhere he says, 'But of that whose type is

adorable and holy, &c.' (23 47.) The adoration or worship of Theodoret in regard to the consecrated elements was confined to the signs or symbols only, and can therefore be no plea for the higher kind of worship which the disciples of Paschasius offer to what they suppose to be the presence of Deity in the elements.

98. Jerome, speaking of the reverence in which the Eucharistic symbols were held, honouring them with their sacramental title of body and blood, requires the same veneration for the vessels containing the body and blood, and also for the things covering them, as he does for the body and blood. (18 11.) Doubtless he cannot here mean Christ's real body and blood, for he certainly would never *consort* with them, lifeless, senseless, material things, nor require for them the same veneration.

99. Some of the Reformers regarded the consecrated elements with peculiar veneration. Thus, Zwingli says, 'We are so to venerate and worship sacraments as signs and symbols, not as if they were the very things of which they are the signs.' (29 13.)

100. Before the reader can adequately understand the teaching of the Fathers on the point under consideration, he must be placed as much as possible in their position and that of those whom they instructed, which, in many particulars, was dissimilar to what is known and practised among Christians at the present day. The sacraments, to the uninitiated, were mysteries, in the ancient and proper sense of the word—that is, unrevealed secrets, and especially the consecrated elements. The teachers would frequently speak of the body and blood of Christ being received in the presence of the uninitiated, but of the sacramental elements, bread and wine, never. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem says, 'Nor before catechumens do we discourse plainly about mysteries; but many things many times we speak in a covert manner, that the faithful who know may understand, and that those who know not may receive no hurt.' (15 4.) How the Fathers generally speak upon this point may be seen in chapter ix. 24, 25 above. Special seasons were set apart for receiving the duly qualified candidates for the sacraments, at which

time definite discourses were delivered to them, and what up to that time had been profound secrets were now fully explained and revealed. It requires no great stretch of the imagination to conceive how great must be the surprise of those just initiated to find that the most profound secret of all in the Eucharist was the use of the elements of bread, and wine, and water, the ordinary food of the body. Their instructors, mostly the Bishops, had to meet this difficulty, and had to be at great pains to convince the neophytes that the bread and wine, by the act of consecration, were much more in signification and meaning than what they appeared to the eye, that now in their use they were no longer to be regarded as common elements, but as symbols, signs, antitypes, or representations of the body and blood of Christ, and of the mystical, but real, union of themselves with that body. How some of the Fathers speak of the things signified by those sacred signs may be seen in chapters x. 38, and xi. 80-103.

101. It remains that we now give the main parts relating to this point as contained in the discourses of those Fathers whom we have chosen as witnesses. Cyril of Jerusalem has given us the fullest account. This is contained in five lectures. The first relates to the rites before baptism. In warning his hearers against idolatry, he shews them that the food of idol festivals is polluted by the invocation of the unclean spirits, even as the food of the Eucharist by the invocation of the Trinity *becomes* the body and blood of Christ, 'so in like manner, such meats belonging to the pomp of Satan, though in their own nature *plain* and simple *become* profane by the invocation of the evil spirit.' (15 7.) He does not mean to teach here that bread and wine really become the body and blood of Christ, but as he plainly teaches a type or antitype of them, as we shall see presently. It is true, he says, they *become* the body and blood, but happily by his use of this word in these discourses, we plainly see that too much stress must not be laid upon it. For addressing the communicants, he says, 'Ye *have become* of the same body and blood with Christ,' 'Thou *mightest become* of the same body and blood with Him,' 'We *become* Christ-bearers.' (15 12.) He also states how the Saviour

shows Himself under various forms to believers for their profit. Thus he says, 'He *becomes* a vine,' 'He *becomes* a 'sheep,' 'He *becomes* all things to all, remaining in His own 'nature what He is.' (15 5.)

102. His second lecture is on the rite of Baptism. Here he shows that believers having by representation been made partakers in common of Christ's sufferings, have obtained salvation in reality, Not that believers had really been crucified, had died, and had risen again, but having received baptism, the antitype or representation of these things, they are planted together in the likeness of His death, &c. 'Well 'has he said "planted together." For since the true vine 'was planted in this place, we also, by a participation in common of the baptism of death, have been planted together 'with Him.' (15 9.)

103. His third lecture is on Chrism, in which he speaks of believers being made Christs, or anointed ones. He calls chrism the antitype of the Holy Ghost, not of course meaning that it was the Holy Ghost any more than the antitype baptism was the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. He then speaks of believers after baptism and chrism as having been made partakers of Christ. (15 10.) He also speaks of consecrated ointment as being only the antitype of the Holy Ghost, but makes a broad distinction between that and plain ointment, and illustrates the change effected in this by the change which is effected in the elements of bread and wine by consecration. (15 10.)

104. The fourth lecture is on the body and blood of Christ. Here he says believers have become of the same body and blood with Christ, and 'since then He Himself has 'declared and said of the bread, "This is my body," who 'shall dare to doubt any longer? Therefore, with fullest 'assurance, let us partake *as* of the body and blood of Christ, 'for in the figure of bread is given to thee His body, &c., 'that thou by partaking of the body and blood of Christ '*mightest become* of the same body and the same blood with 'Him; for thus we *become* Christ-bearers.' (15 12.) Here beyond all question the believer, in the same sense in which he *becomes* of the same body and the same blood of Christ,

of Augustine the signs which signify His word are durable, but sacramental signs made for the purpose of signifying His body and blood being consumed, are transient, (21 19,) and require reproduction, and herein differ from the signs of the Word of God, which are permanent. By what human instrumentality are those signs produced? for that is really the question. Now Romanists confound what is seen with what is unseen, spiritual with what is material, and what is human with what is divine, and in their solicitude to have an adequate cause to effect a thing so stupendous as making ordinary bread and wine into Christ's real body and blood, and also the sacrifice of these to be a continuation or repetition of what was done at the first by a high-priestly act, they would make Christ the actual and instrumental Consecrator and Sacrificer, whereas the evidence adduced proves no such thing. No one pretends that Christ baptizes and ordains instrumentally, no one ought to pretend that He administers the Lord's Supper, or consecrates the elements instrumentally. These rites are of His institution, and, if performed according to His will, are as if He Himself performed them. This is especially the case with the Lord's Supper. Chrysostom most plainly and impressively teaches that Christ once instituted His Supper, which should be in force until His second coming, as He, in the opinion of the Fathers, once said 'increase and multiply and replenish the earth' is effectual through all time. Romanists would feign persuade themselves and others that, because Chrysostom says in the first of the above extracts, 'the priest stands 'filling up a figure speaking those sayings,' he necessarily meant the words of institution, and that pronouncing these was the essential part of the consecration. But to this there are two objections which are fatal to the inference. Chrysostom could not refer to that which came after as 'those,' and that which does come after is not sayings, but saying, and Christ is said to utter 'this saying,' as also His voice is said to utter 'Be fruitful and multiply, &c.' In the latter case He instituted once, and once for all coming time, the increase of the human species by saying, 'Be fruitful and multiply, &c.' In the former case too, He instituted his Holy Supper once, and once for all until His coming again by 'this saying,'

'This is my body,' and hence it is called the words of institution. By 'this saying' Chrysostom doubtless meant the words of institution, by 'those words,' he as certainly meant the words commonly used in the act of consecration, and well known to the initiated.

83. Chrysostom plainly teaches that the rites which Christ instituted when subsequently performed in accordance with His will are in no respect inferior to the first. He no more teaches that Christ actually and personally presides at the Lord's Supper than that every place in the world where the Eucharist is celebrated is actually and identically the upper chamber in which our blessed Lord instituted and first celebrated it with His apostles. His idea is, that what Christ commanded to be done, when done, is the same as if He Himself did it, as at the institution and first celebration. Was Christ present then? 'He is present now.' Did He adorn that table? 'He adorneth this now.' 'He that did 'these things at that supper, this same now also works them.' 'This table is the same as that, and hath nothing less.' 'This 'is that upper chamber where they were then.' (22 9.) 'Believe 'therefore, that even now it is that supper at which He Himself sat down.' It is Christ's hand that is stretched out,' not the priest's. 'Even as when the priest baptizes, he doth 'not baptize thee, but it is God.' (22 5.) 'The hand of man 'is laid upon the person, and it is the hand of God 'which toucheth the head of the one ordained, if he be duly 'ordained.' It is not necessary to remark that this striking and impressive manner of speaking, as employed by Chrysostom, is not intended to ignore human agency, either in the sacrament of Baptism, the sacrament of Eucharist, or the rite of ordination, and if not, we cannot see what help Romanists and Romanizers can get therefrom in defence of their doctrine. But so far from ignoring human agency they rigidly maintain that unless the consecration of the elements be performed by one who by ordination has received the power of sacrificing from the Apostles there can be no valid consecration, and no Lord's supper. This is what we maintain is contrary to the teaching of the early Church.

84. We shall now show that the act of consecration, accord-

ing to the teaching of the Fathers was the act of all the communicants, and not exclusively the prerogative of any special order of clergymen. We learn this very distinctly from Justin, who teaches that the consecration was effected by thanksgiving, which was done through one who presided, and to which act he says, 'the whole people express their assent;' 'the people having assented,' (7 1, 2.) Speaking as a layman he states, 'the bread which our Christ gave us to do in remembrance, . . . and the cup which He gave us to do in remembrance of His own blood with giving of thanks.' (7 3.) Elsewhere representing the celebration of the Lord's Supper in sacrificial language, he includes all the communicants as sacrificers. Thus speaking of himself as a layman and of Christians generally, he says, 'We are the true high-priestly race of God, as even God Himself bears witness, &c.' 'Now God receives sacrifices from no one, except through His priests. Therefore anticipating all the sacrifices which we do through this name, . . . you assert that God . . . is pleased with the prayers of the individuals of that nation then dispersed, and calls their prayers sacrifices. Now that prayers and giving of thanks, when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God, I also admit. For such alone Christians have undertaken to do.' (7 4, 5.) This is the earliest and most important testimony of antiquity respecting the ritual of the Lord's Supper, and it is fully confirmed by subsequent witnesses. But before adducing these it will be more convenient to ascertain what is commonly brought forward in more modern times to prove that the essential part of the consecration is effected by a particular order of men, to whom has been committed special powers, and without the exercise of those powers by one duly entrusted with them there can be no consecration, and consequently no valid Eucharist. Roman Catholics, Ritualists, and High Anglicans, alike maintain this view. Dr Moberly, Bishop of Salisbury, an avowed believer in the doctrine of the real objective presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, with apparently very great confidence and certainty maintains that

'In order to constitute its complete character according to the di-

‘vine pattern of its institution, it absolutely requires two things. First, there must be the consecration of the elements by the priest, the organ of the priestly Church, empowered by sacred ordinance to do that solemn and indispensable portion of the joint act which none else may presume to exercise or intrude upon. For it is no common nor ordinary work which he has to do. It is no light thing that by the acts that he organically does, and the words which he organically utters, the spiritual presence of the Lord is so brought down upon the elements of bread and wine as that to the faithful they become verily and indeed, however invisibly and mysteriously, the body and blood of Christ. Through him, in this great priestly work, the whole spiritual life and force which is in the priestly Church, operates as in its highest function. It is only through the sacred gift that is in him by the laying on of apostolic hands, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, that he may venture or presume to do it. This is assuredly the first thing. While the Church, in respect of Holy Baptism, has recognised the fact that though for purposes of honour and order it is right to confine the ordinary and authorised administration of the sacrament to the clergy, yet the gift is not so exclusively in their hands as not to be imparted in any degree by lay people in her communion, or even, if the sacred words and the water are used, by the hands of those who are outside of her communion altogether, there has never been a question of the absolute confinement of the power of consecrating the bread and wine to their mysterious efficacy of becoming to the faithful and to the Church of the faithful the body and blood of the Lord, to the ordained clergy. When I say there has never been a question on this point, I must be understood to mean among Church writers, and in the Church—from St Ignatius to St Bernard, from St Bernard to the days in which the tyranny of perfected sacerdotalism produced its unhappy, but not unnatural effect in the disowning of all divine descent of special priesthood in the Church together. It is needless to quote passages. It is the absolutely universal doctrine of Church writers of every age that to the priesthood alone belongs the power of consecrating the elements to become to the faithful the body and blood of Christ. They have been made by personal authorization and empowerment, the only capable organs for this purpose of the priestliness which, as I have repeatedly said, inheres ultimately in the whole priestly Church, which is priestly as being the body of the One and only Priest, our Lord Jesus Christ.’—(*The Administration of the Holy Spirit in the body of Christ*, pp. 168-170.)

85 This is a most unfortunate utterance, for it is simply untrue from first to last. The very same authority on which he properly considers that the right of baptizing, though by right inherent in Christian laymen for the purposes of honour and order was confined to the clergy (or rather to the bishops, for that is the word which he ought to have used, as

we shall show presently) maintains the very same thing respecting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, viz., that every Christian layman has an inherent right to administer it, but by a human arrangement it was restricted to the clergy. The authority in question is Tertullian, and his testimony in regard to the right of administering baptism is introduced by the bishop as follows :

'There is sufficient evidence to show that the early Church did not regard the power of baptizing in the bishop, and by his commission, as a matter of necessary doctrine, but as one of ecclesiastical order and propriety, according to the words of Tertullian; "The right of giving Baptism belongs to the chief priest, that is, the bishop; then to the priests and deacons, yet not without the authority of the bishop, on account of the honour of the Church; for when that is safe, peace is safe." That laymen were not authorized to baptize is quite clear, for there are express prohibitions of such practice to be found. But, on the other hand, besides that express prohibitions are some evidence of a claim actual or possible, it is also clear that the ground of such prohibition lay not in the doctrine, but in the ecclesiastical discipline of the Church. This is plain from the sequel of the just quoted passage of Tertullian, "for otherwise," he says, "laymen also have the right of baptizing. For what is equally received may equally be given. Likewise baptism, equally regarded as of God can be administered by all; but how much more is the discipline of modesty incumbent on laymen, since these things belong to their superiors, not to usurp the duty of the episcopal office reserved to bishops."—*Ibid.* pp. 132, 133.

The passage in a connected form, as cited from the writings of Tertullian, is given, (10 3.) From this, and also from what the bishop has cited, the argument of Tertullian just as much applies to the administration of the Lord's Supper as it does to Baptism. Tertullian's argument, as given by Bishop Moberly, is—"Laymen also have the right of baptizing. For what is equally received may equally be given. Likewise Baptism, equally regarded as of God, can be administered by all." We have only to apply the argument to the Eucharist thus, the Eucharist is equally received, and therefore can be equally given. Likewise the Eucharist, equally regarded as of God, can be administered by all; and we have the true sentiments of Tertullian and of early antiquity, and if, in the above extract from the Bishop, the Eucharist is substituted

for Baptism, what he has said would be just as true of the former as of the latter. We have still more direct evidence to adduce from Tertullian as given **10 17**, where he maintains, on the authority of Holy Scripture, that all laymen are priests, and he made this the basis of an important argument to prove that whatever in regard to discipline is required of the clergy should be required of the laity also. He affirms too that the distinction between a clergyman and a layman, as it existed in his time, was established by the authority of the Church, and in places where that order of things was not established, Christian laymen both baptized and administered the Lord's Supper, and were priests alone to themselves. Nor were these sentiments of Tertullian unknown to the Bishop, for he apparently cites them with approval, together with the passage relating to Baptism (a translation of which is given **10 3**), to prove 'the inherent power of lay-people.' The extract translated is as follows,

'Are not even we laymen priests? It is written: "A kingdom also, "and priests to His God and Father, hath He made us." It is the 'authority of the Church, and the honour which has acquired sanctity 'through the joint session of the Order, which has established the 'difference between the order and the laity. Accordingly, where 'there is no joint session of the ecclesiastical order, you offer, [ad- 'minister the Lord's Supper,] and baptize, and are priest alone for 'yourself. But where three are, a church is, albeit they be laymen.' —*Note Y*, p. 295.

The passage, with much more of the context, is given. (**10 17**.) The Bishop's statement then respecting the exclusive power of the priest in regard to the consecration or administration of the Lord's Supper, is flatly contradicted, not only by His own chosen witness, but by the very two passages which He has cited with approval to prove 'the inherent power of lay-people.'

86. It is plain from both of these passages that Tertullian regarded the particular distinction between the clergy and laity as being of post-apostolic origin and of human arrangement. Hilary the deacon, in his excellent commentary on St Paul's epistles, gives a similar account of the origin of the clerical office, thus he says, 'That the people might increase 'and be multiplied, in the beginning it was permitted to

‘every one to preach the gospel, to baptize, and to expound the Scriptures in the Church; but when the Church embraced all places, there were certain places of assembly appointed, governors and other officers ordained in the churches, so that no one of the clergy who was not ordained would dare to take upon himself an office which he knew was not entrusted or conceded to him. And the Church began to be governed by another order.’ (*Comment. in Epist. ad Ephe., Opera Ambrosii*, tom. iii. col. 504).

87. When bishops ceased to be congregational, village, or small town bishops, and became more like what they are at the present day, they relinquished one part of the rite of baptism, but retained confirmation, which, according to the earliest Fathers, originally was one of the two sacraments of baptism. (See ch. viii. 67; ix. 103.) Jerome, speaking upon this subject much after the same manner of Tertullian, says, ‘In many places, this [the restriction of confirmation to the bishop] was done rather for the honour of the chief priesthood, than for an absolute necessity of the thing. . . . Hence it arises that without the chrism, and without the injunction of the bishop, neither the presbyter nor the deacon has a right to baptize. Which frequently, if necessity urges, we know it is also lawful to laymen; for as any one receives, so also can he give.’ (189.) Dr Pusey himself very properly admits that both this argument and that of Tertullian, which is like it, ‘would equally justify Presbyterian ordination,’ as it does baptism by laymen. (*Preface to the Writings of Tertullian*, pp. xv., xvi.) Who can doubt that it equally justifies the administration of the Lord’s Supper by laymen as a matter of inherent right, but not of constituted order.

88. Augustine appears to have held the same sentiments as Tertullian and Jerome, and moreover shows that they were commonly held in his day. Gratian gives an extract from an epistle of Augustine to Fortunatus, which is as follows: ‘We are accustomed to hear that even laymen are wont to give a sacrament which they have received.’ (*Corpus Juris Canonici*, pars 3 de cons. dist. 4 c. 21.)

89. We have already seen, according to the teaching of

the Fathers, that the act of consecration consisted in giving thanks to God or blessing Him, but this has ever been considered to be a congregational act. Augustine, as a specimen of the rest, states, in explaining the order of the sacrament, 'The bishop or presbyter who offers says, "Let us "give thanks unto our Lord God," for ye lift up your heart : "and ye attest, saying, "It is meet and right" that we also "give thanks to Him who made us to lift up the heart to our "Head. Then after the consecration, &c.' (21 127.) Chrysostom even yet states more distinctly the same thing. When addressing the communicants, he said, 'There were 'occasions in which there was no difference at all between the 'priest and those under him ; for instance, when we are to 'partake of the awful mysteries. . . . For in the most 'awful mysteries themselves the priest prays for the people, 'and the people pray for the priest, for the words "with thy 'spirit," are nothing else than this. The offering of thanksgiving again is common to all, for neither doth he give 'thanks alone, but also all the people. For having first 'taken their voices, next when they assent that it is "meet ' "and right so to do," then he begins the thanksgiving.' He concludes by remarking, 'Now I have said this in order 'that each one of the laity also may keep their attention 'awake, that we may understand that we are all one body, 'having such differences amongst ourselves as members with 'members.' (22 25.)

90. Gaudentius in addressing the newly baptised evidently considered them as sacrificers and consecrators in the rite of the Lord's Supper, for he says, 'One died for all : and the 'same being sacrificed in the mystery of bread and wine at 'every communion, refresheth ; being believed, quickeneth ; 'being consecrated, sanctifieth, the consecrators.' (19 3.) That Gaudentius here included the communicants as sacrificers and consecrators admits of confirmation by Bernard, the most valuable Christian author of the eleventh century ; at least we find the following ascribed to him in his writings : 'Dearest brethren, such ought we to be who consecrate the 'body of Christ, when we sacrifice, eating it after consecration. ' . . . Nor indeed ought we to believe that the above-

‘mentioned virtues are necessary to the priest only as though he alone consecrates and sacrifices the body of Christ. He doth not sacrifice alone ; he doth not consecrate alone. But the whole congregation of the faithful which standeth by consecrateth with Him, sacrificeth along with Him. Nor doth the carpenter alone build the house ; but one brings laths, another timber, another beams, and other things to the work. The bystanders therefore are bound to contribute somewhat of their own as the priest also doth, firm faith, pure prayers, pious devotion.’ (*Sermo in die Pun.*, tom. ii. f. 257).

91. We have yet another citation to make from Chrysostom, who says, ‘I am about to say what may appear strange, but be not astonished nor startled at it. The offering is the same, whether a common man or Paul or Peter offer it.’ (22 31.) The question is, What does he mean by a common man ? Does he mean a Christian layman or a bishop or presbyter ? The *Church Review*, an organ of the Ritualists, maintains the latter view. The author of ‘Whose are the Fathers?’ &c., in that work had cited the same passage from Chrysostom to prove that the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, administered by a Christian layman, would be a valid sacrament. A reviewer in the above named periodical said, A string of quotations from the Fathers then follows, the object of which is to prove that they held that there was no distinction between a priest and a layman—that there was nothing which a priest did that a layman might not do. In this list of passages we find one quotation so flagrantly and notoriously dishonest, that we cannot allow it to pass without notice. “Chrysostom confirms this view of the case. The offering (the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper) is the same whether a common man or Paul or Peter offer it.” (p. 75.) The inference naturally would be from this, that St Chrysostom allowed any “common man,” to offer the holy sacrifice, whereas the “common man” means any one PRIEST. “It is the same,” he says, “which Christ gave to His disciples, and which the *priests* now minister.” (April 27, 1867.) It is denied that it is to be inferred from what Chrysostom has said that *he would allow* any common man to administer the Lord’s Supper. This was not *allowed*

as according to order in the time of Tertullian, 200 years before. But what if any Christian layman did administer that holy ordinance contrary to rule and order it is maintained that according to the teaching both of Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom, the ordinance itself so administered would nevertheless be the Lord's Supper.

92. Romanists, Ritualists, and High Anglicans, rigidly maintain that there can be no valid administration of the sacrament, except by one who is of the apostolical succession. Dr Pusey says, 'The doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice 'depends upon the real objective presence. Where there is 'the apostolical succession and a consecration in our Lord's 'words, there it is held by the Roman authorities too.' (35 56.) The theory, however, of apostolical succession, as held by Romanists and High Anglicans, is altogether different. The High Anglicans rigidly hold that every duly consecrated bishop is by that act invested with the apostleship of the twelve; the Romanists hold no such thing, but by ordination only, the priesthood of the apostles, that is the power of sacrificing Christ's body and blood, is handed down. High Anglicans admit also that this is handed down. Dr Hamilton states, 'I maintain that there were those in the first days of 'the Gospel, who had received in a very special and peculiar 'way from the one Priest, special powers of sacrificing. The 'powers committed to the apostles were transmitted by the 'apostles in the name and place of their Lord to other men.' (38 1.) This is the exact doctrine of Roman Catholics as may be seen. (38 2.) The *Church Review* agrees with the Roman view of apostolical succession, and not with the High Anglican. The author of 'Whose are the Fathers?' also published a treatise on 'The Primitive Mode of making 'Bishops,' in which he proved that apostolical succession, as held by High Anglicans, was not taught by the Fathers. A reviewer in the *Church Review* admits this, and says, 'Mr Harrison sees that neither election nor confirmation, 'according to Roman Catholic canons, is used in making 'English bishops, and that they therefore rest the whole 'weight of their claim to authority on their consecration by 'apostolical succession. . . . But this is a claim peculiar to

‘High Anglicans, and unknown to primitive Christianity. . . .
 ‘Consecration by apostolical succession gives the sacramental
 ‘character of priesthood, and in the case of a bishop being
 ‘made, it confers high priesthood.’ (*August 27, 1870.*)
 Romanists, Ritualists, and High Anglicans, alike maintain
 that their notions of apostolical succession were believed every-
 where, always, and by all, Chrysostom not excepted. In the
 face of such a belief, how could they conceive that he would
 call a priest, whether bishop or presbyter, *a common man*,
 and tell the communicants that he was about to say some-
 thing strange, and caution them not to be astonished nor
 startled at it, viz., that the Lord’s Supper administered by a
 man who had been invested with the apostleship of Peter and
 Paul, or, at the very least, with their priesthood, would be
 the same as if Peter or Paul administered it. It has yet to
 be proved that Chrysostom, or any other Father, held either
 Roman or High Anglican views of apostolical succession. He
 certainly had a very exalted conception of the office of a
 bishop and presbyter, and we think it impossible that he
 could call either one or the other a common man. If we allow
 Chrysostom to interpret what he means by ‘a common man,’
 we shall come to the certain conclusion that he denotes, as
 we should say, one not in orders, that is, neither bishop nor
 presbyter. Speaking of the apostles not as specially called
 and divinely qualified by Christ, but in the relation in which
 they stood to the constituted authorities of the Jewish Church,
 as unlearned and ignorant men, or rather as men not then
 ranked among the learned, and not in any public office, but
 in private life, Chrysostom says, ‘For they (their disciples)
 ‘did not despise the apostles as common men (*ὡς τῶν συγχιτώνων*
 ‘*καταργούνων*), nor did they fix their regard upon that which is
 ‘visible merely.’ (*In Acta Apos.*, hom. vii., tom. viii.,
 p. 499.)

93. To come back to Bishop Moberly. What he correctly
 affirms of the administration of baptism, and very incorrectly
 denies of the administration of the Eucharist may, according
 not only to the teaching of Tertullian and Jerome, but also
 according to that of Chrysostom, be affirmed of the admini-
 stration of the Eucharist. Expressed in the Bishop’s words,

it would stand thus. There is sufficient evidence to 'show 'that the early Church did not regard the power of' administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper 'in the bishop, 'and by his commission, as a matter of necessary doctrine, 'but as one of ecclesiastical order and propriety, according to 'the words of Tertullian,' Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom.

94. Bishop Hamilton, the immediate predecessor of the present bishop, Dr Moberly, maintained that the celebrant, if in the apostolic succession, and otherwise properly qualified, performs a high priestly office. Thus he says, 'They who in 'obedience to His charge, "Do this in remembrance of me," 'do thus act as priests, and exhibit in their celebrations of 'the Eucharist . . . their delegation to the duties and the 'dignities and the ministrations of the priesthood of Jesus 'Christ.' (38 5.) Archdeacon Freeman also teaches that 'The act of consecration is left to the High Priest Himself,' and that 'The Consecrator is still no other than Christ, pre-'senting effectually, though by the hand of earthly ministers, 'the gift.' (*Principles of Divine Service*, vol. ii., pt. ii., pp. 363-65.)

95. This doctrine respecting Christ's being still a sacrificing priest, is the common doctrine of Roman Catholics. To this it is answered that Christ, according to the teaching of the Fathers, has ceased to be a sacrificer, and therefore in that capacity can have no representatives. Rabanus Maurus, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, has not only well expressed his own views, but also those of the early Fathers generally. On the phrase, 'For this He did once 'when he offered up Himself' (Heb. vii. 27,) he remarks, 'When thou hearest that Christ is a high priest, do not think 'that He is always performing the office of high priest. He 'certainly has been once constituted in the high priesthood, 'henceforth He hath sat down; and lest thou shouldest sup-'pose that He stands and is a minister again, whence the 'apostle shows that the duty of the office hath been finished. ' . . . For as He was made a Servant, so also He was made 'a high priest and minister. For it is not the duty of a 'minister to sit down, but to stand.' (26 14.) As to how Chrysostom, Œcumenius, and Theophylact spoke on this sub-

ject (see chapter vi. 25-27). The undoubted teaching of these Fathers forbids the very idea of Christ acting as a sacrificing high priest, and to pretend that he has any sacrificial successors is presumptuous in the extreme.

96. Both Romanists and Ritualists maintain that at every celebration of the Eucharist there is a continuation or repetition of Christ's sacrifice. How contrary this also is to Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers has already been shown in other parts of this volume, more especially in chapter vi. 28-30. Although both Romanists and Ritualists zealously maintain that Christ is the only Consecrator of the sacramental elements, yet they strenuously contend for an exclusive priestly order of men, through whom He consecrates; and that without one of this order there can be no valid sacrament, and that He constituted this order in His apostles and their successors when He said 'Do this in remembrance of me.' How contrary this is to the Holy Scripture and the general teaching of the Fathers has already been shown in chapter vi. 9-18, more especially from the fact that according to both sources of appeal, the words 'Do this' are alike applicable to all Christians, and are not exclusively confined to any particular class.

97. One very important point for consideration is the effect of consecration in regard to the elements. That common bread and wine, by consecration, could be made the medium through which faith might more fully realise certain definite objects of infinite moment, and thus stand in the same relation as the revealed Word of God, was a reality respecting which the Fathers felt strongly, and often spoke in their loftiest style. Moreover, the consecrated elements were, in the judgment of the Fathers, tokens of things past as well as pledges of things to come, to every devout communicant, and were especially instituted by Christ to be the medium of special fellowship of believers with one another and with their Divine Head. The consecrated symbols were regarded as being most sacred, and were even venerated. Thus, Theodoret says, 'The symbols are believed, and are venerated 'as if they were those things which they are believed to be.' (23 45.) ; and elsewhere he says, 'But of that whose type is

adorable and holy, &c.' (23 47.) The adoration or worship of Theodoret in regard to the consecrated elements was confined to the signs or symbols only, and can therefore be no plea for the higher kind of worship which the disciples of Paschasius offer to what they suppose to be the presence of Deity in the elements.

98. Jerome, speaking of the reverence in which the Eucharistic symbols were held, honouring them with their sacramental title of body and blood, requires the same veneration for the vessels containing the body and blood, and also for the things covering them, as he does for the body and blood. (18 11.) Doubtless he cannot here mean Christ's real body and blood, for he certainly would never *consort* with them, lifeless, senseless, material things, nor require for them the same veneration.

99. Some of the Reformers regarded the consecrated elements with peculiar veneration. Thus, Zwingli says, 'We are so to venerate and worship sacraments as signs and symbols, not as if they were the very things of which they are the signs.' (29 13.)

100. Before the reader can adequately understand the teaching of the Fathers on the point under consideration, he must be placed as much as possible in their position and that of those whom they instructed, which, in many particulars, was dissimilar to what is known and practised among Christians at the present day. The sacraments, to the uninitiated, were mysteries, in the ancient and proper sense of the word—that is, unrevealed secrets, and especially the consecrated elements. The teachers would frequently speak of the body and blood of Christ being received in the presence of the uninitiated, but of the sacramental elements, bread and wine, never. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem says, 'Nor before catechumens do we discourse plainly about mysteries; but many things many times we speak in a covert manner, that the faithful who know may understand, and that those who know not may receive no hurt.' (15 4.) How the Fathers generally speak upon this point may be seen in chapter ix. 24, 25 above. Special seasons were set apart for receiving the duly qualified candidates for the sacraments, at which

time definite discourses were delivered to them, and what up to that time had been profound secrets were now fully explained and revealed. It requires no great stretch of the imagination to conceive how great must be the surprise of those just initiated to find that the most profound secret of all in the Eucharist was the use of the elements of bread, and wine, and water, the ordinary food of the body. Their instructors, mostly the Bishops, had to meet this difficulty, and had to be at great pains to convince the neophytes that the bread and wine, by the act of consecration, were much more in signification and meaning than what they appeared to the eye, that now in their use they were no longer to be regarded as common elements, but as symbols, signs, antitypes, or representations of the body and blood of Christ, and of the mystical, but real, union of themselves with that body. How some of the Fathers speak of the things signified by those sacred signs may be seen in chapters x. 38, and xi. 80-103.

101. It remains that we now give the main parts relating to this point as contained in the discourses of those Fathers whom we have chosen as witnesses. Cyril of Jerusalem has given us the fullest account. This is contained in five lectures. The first relates to the rites before baptism. In warning his hearers against idolatry, he shews them that the food of idol festivals is polluted by the invocation of the unclean spirits, even as the food of the Eucharist by the invocation of the Trinity *becomes* the body and blood of Christ, 'so in like manner, such meats belonging to the pomp of Satan, though in their own nature *plain* and simple *become* profane by the invocation of the evil spirit.' (15 7.) He does not mean to teach here that bread and wine really become the body and blood of Christ, but as he plainly teaches a type or antitype of them, as we shall see presently. It is true, he says, they *become* the body and blood, but happily by his use of this word in these discourses, we plainly see that too much stress must not be laid upon it. For addressing the communicants, he says, 'Ye *have become* of the same body and blood with Christ,' 'Thou *mightest become* of the same body and blood with Him,' 'We *become* Christ-bearers.' (15 12.) He also states how the Saviour

shows Himself under various forms to believers for their profit. Thus he says, 'He *becomes* a vine,' 'He *becomes* a 'sheep,' 'He *becomes* all things to all, remaining in His own 'nature what He is.' (15 5.)

102. His second lecture is on the rite of Baptism. Here he shows that believers having by representation been made partakers in common of Christ's sufferings, have obtained salvation in reality, Not that believers had really been crucified, had died, and had risen again, but having received baptism, the antitype or representation of these things, they are planted together in the likeness of His death, &c. 'Well 'has he said "planted together." For since the true vine 'was planted in this place, we also, by a participation in common of the baptism of death, have been planted together 'with Him.' (15 9.)

103. His third lecture is on Chrism, in which he speaks of believers being made Christs, or anointed ones. He calls chrism the antitype of the Holy Ghost, not of course meaning that it was the Holy Ghost any more than the antitype baptism was the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. He then speaks of believers after baptism and chrism as having been made partakers of Christ. (15 10.) He also speaks of consecrated ointment as being only the antitype of the Holy Ghost, but makes a broad distinction between that and plain ointment, and illustrates the change effected in this by the change which is effected in the elements of bread and wine by consecration. (15 10.)

104. The fourth lecture is on the body and blood of Christ. Here he says believers have become of the same body and blood with Christ, and 'since then He Himself has 'declared and said of the bread, "This is my body," who 'shall dare to doubt any longer? Therefore, with fullest 'assurance, let us partake *as* of the body and blood of Christ, 'for in the figure of bread is given to thee His body, &c., 'that thou by partaking of the body and blood of Christ '*mightest become* of the same body and the same blood with 'Him; for thus we *become* Christ-bearers.' (15 12.) Here beyond all question the believer, in the same sense in which he *becomes* of the same body and the same blood of Christ,

and *becomes* a Christ-bearer in that same sense, and no other, receives in the figure of bread the body of Christ, and in the figure of wine His blood, which certainly is not the body which was born of Mary, nor the blood which was shed by the soldier's spear. He then reminds the communicants of the error of the Jews in not hearing *spiritually* what Christ had said respecting their eating His flesh and drinking His blood. (15 12.) He yet further impresses on the minds of the communicants the object and design of the consecrated elements, and cautions them against regarding them as plain bread and wine. We are not to conclude from their ceasing to be plain that their nature was changed. We have seen that bread or meat used for idolatrous purposes by the invocation of the evil spirit ceased to be plain, and became profane, and, according to the teaching of the Apostle Paul, might be the medium of coming into the fellowship of devils, as believers by partaking of the consecrated elements in the Eucharist might have the communion or fellowship of the body and blood of Christ. (See chap. v. 9-15 above.) He also speaks of the consecrated ointment, as having ceased to be plain ointment, but from that circumstance no one pretends that its nature was changed. The only change effected in this and the case just noticed was, as to object and use. The like change and no other was effected in the elements of the Eucharist, according to the plain teaching of Cyril. Mill, in his excellent edition of Cyril's works, has well remarked in a Latin note, 'What Cyril intended by the body and blood of Christ, is not only manifested from this, that in the preceding lectures, after the words of consecration, he has asserted 'no other change of the symbols of the Eucharist, than of the baptismal water and the oil of blessing, but from those things also which are contained in the following lecture respecting this point, "O taste and see that the Lord is "good; trust not the decision to thy bodily palate: no, but "to faith unflinching; for when we taste, we are bidden to "taste, not bread and wine, but the *antitype* of the body 'and blood of Christ"' (15 15), p. 292.

105. The fifth and last lecture is on the communion service, and the main point of it is the circumstance, as just noticed

above, that Cyril calls the consecrated elements, as received by the communicants, not really the body and blood of Christ, but an antitype or representation of them.

106. Now if the doctrine of Paschasius and his disciples is to be found anywhere in the writings of the Fathers, most undoubtedly it must be found in discourses of this kind, devoted specially to an exposition of the sacraments, where they would rather over than under state their estimate of them. We ask is it conceivable that if Cyril, or the author of these lectures, whoever he may be, had believed that the consecrated elements were not only antitypes or representations of Christ's body and blood, but were also the very realities, that he could have spoken as he has done? By selecting detached sentences from these lectures, as Dr Pusey has done, a plausible but deceptive appearance of evidence can be adduced for the doctrine in question, but such a mode of exhibiting the teaching of the Fathers does not rightly instruct the reader, but deceives him.

107. The testimony on the present point next in order is contained in an anonymous treatise usually published in the writings of Ambrose, which will be found **17 16**. Like Cyril, he plainly gives us to understand that the sacrament of the Eucharist was no more that which it represented than the sacrament of Baptism was, that as Baptism was a likeness of death, so the Eucharistic symbols were a likeness of Christ's body and blood. And as Cyril represented the consecrated elements as an antitype of Christ's body and blood, so this ancient author speaks of them as a figure of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

108. Gaudentius is the next important witness in order. He has twenty-four discourses to neophytes on the Lord's Supper. Seven of them are founded on the institution of the Jewish Passover by Moses, as recorded in Exodus xii. **1-12**. It is the second of these with which we are more especially concerned, and nearly the whole is given (**19 1-14**), which the reader is requested carefully to study. He commences by teaching that the law has a spiritual meaning, and points to Christ our Passover who was sacrificed for us. (**19 1**.) He then enumerates several things which he intended to explain

spiritually, intimating that he should confine himself to those things which could only be explained to neophytes in the absence of the uninitiated. (19 2.) He then shows that in the Jewish Passover many lambs were slain, but in the fulfilment of the type, one only, that is, the Lord Jesus Christ, that He being sacrificed in the mysteries, that is, the consecrated symbols or signs of bread and wine, refreshes ; being believed on in them, quickens ; being consecrated in them, sanctifies the consecrators. It surely cannot be pretended that all this is to be understood literally, that the body born of Mary and the blood shed on the cross are actually and really in the mysteries or consecrated signs of bread and wine. (19 3.) He then shows what the flesh of the Lamb and His blood are. ‘For the bread which came down from heaven saith, “The bread which I will give is my flesh for the life “ of the world.”’ In this phrase we have a figure of speech, for here Christ most certainly represents His body under the metaphor of bread ; as Theodoret says, our Lord here called His body bread. (23 20. See sec. 34 above.) His body was not really bread, and no more, according to the teaching of Gaudentius, was the Eucharistic bread really the flesh or body of Christ. His explanation of the other element will make this quite certain. He says : ‘Rightly, too, is the ‘ blood expressed, signified, or represented by the form, that ‘ is, sacrament or sacred sign of wine, in that He saith in the ‘ Gospel, “I am the true Vine.” He himself plainly declares ‘ that all the wine which is offered in the figure of His ‘ passion is His blood.’ Nor is this all, for he finds in the Eucharist a metaphor corresponding to the wine and the blood of the grape in Jacob’s prophecy. (19 4.) And as in the judgment of the Fathers, such as Clement (9 5), Tertullian (10 14), Origen (11 20), Cyprian (12 5), Ruffinus (20 1-4), Theodoret (23 1, 38, 39, 41), and of Gaudentius himself, the prophecy had its accomplishment in the body of Christ, that is, His church being washed in His blood. The same metaphor or figure which is employed in the prophecy is employed in the Eucharist to represent the same thing. Here this Latin Father is teaching the very same doctrine as that taught by Theodoret, a Greek Father who lived a

hundred years later,—namely, that the consecrated bread was no more Christ's body in the Eucharist than His body was bread in the Gospel of St John; that the consecrated wine in the Eucharist was no more Christ's blood than He himself was a vine in St John's Gospel: or His blood wine, or the blood of the grape in the prophecy of Jacob. The bread and the wine in St John's Gospel, and the wine and the blood of the grape in the prophecy of Jacob, were not properly sacramental, but the bread and the wine in the Eucharist are. Now, with the Fathers, to consecrate bread and wine into a sacrament, sacred sign, or figure of Christ's body and blood, was considered to be a divine act though performed through human instrumentality. With them due consecration was a divine reality. He says, 'Himself, then, the 'Creator and Lord of nature, who bringeth forth bread from 'the earth, of bread again (for He both can and hath promised), makes His own body; and He who of water made 'wine makes also of wine His own blood.' (19 4.) Here Gaudentius has expressed himself with much caution, so that those to whom he addressed himself could not well misunderstand his meaning. He uses his words with discrimination, which is not made to appear in Dr Pusey's translation. Gaudentius does not use a word which absolutely teaches that Christ *made* bread His body, and wine His blood. The word he employs to describe the change effected in regard to the bread and wine is commonly employed in the Latin version of the Scriptures in use in his day, in a non-absolute or figurative sense in such passages as, 'He that is joined to 'a harlot *is made* one flesh.' (1 Cor. vi. 16.) 'Brethren, do 'not *be made* or *become* children in sense.' (xiv. 20.) How Jerome and Augustine use the same word may be seen 18 25, 45, and 21 19, 104. If we here understand Gaudentius as Dr Pusey and Papists understand him, namely, that he teaches that the elements, by consecration, are really made the body and blood of Christ, he, in the very same discourse, is made flatly to contradict himself. He plainly says that the wine *expresses* or *represents* Christ's blood, and he speaks of the wine as offered *in the figure* of His passion. (19 4.) He calls the elements 'the *mysteries* of the Lord's passion.' (19 8.)

‘*Pledge* of His presence,’ and ‘*image* of His own passion.’ (19 10.) ‘*Pattern* of Christ’s passion.’ (19 11.) The *sacraments*, that is, the *sacred signs*, ‘of His body and blood, to ‘be offered in the form of bread and wine.’ (19 12.) Mark, he does not teach, as the Papists would persuade us, that the real body and real blood of Christ are offered under the shams, or shows, or mere accidents, of bread and wine; but the *sacraments* of His body and blood are offered in the form of real bread and wine. He expressly says too, that the bread is taken as a figure of the body of Christ, and the wine as a figure of his blood (19 13, 14), and plainly tells us, in the very same discourse, that ‘a figure is not the truth or reality, ‘but an imitation of it.’ (19 3.) Moreover, as we shall notice presently, the mode of participating of the body of Christ is utterly fatal to the idea of the real body of Christ being in the consecrated bread.

109. Here (19 4) and elsewhere in the same discourse, Gaudentius, in common with other Fathers, impresses upon the minds of the communicants the effects of consecration and the force and meaning of sacramental language, especially the phrases, ‘This is my body,’ ‘This is my blood.’ The abuse of the sacramental language of Scripture by the Paschasians is no legitimate reason for its disuse, as it appears to be considered by a large number of the more zealous evangelical Protestants at the present day. This indirectly gives the Paschasians a great advantage, of which they are not slow to avail themselves. The sacramental phraseology of the Fathers, which, for the most part, is that of the Bible, where sacraments, or signs of sacred things, are called by the names of the things themselves, is now very prominently introduced, and evangelical and Protestant Christians, not being familiar with such phrases, nor understanding what they mean, come to the mistaken conclusion that the ancient Fathers were, in Eucharistic doctrine, modern Romanists and Romanizers; whereas nothing could be further from the truth. The Reformers, both English and Continental, because they retained the use of this sacramental language, are, at the present day, notwithstanding their learned, able, and triumphant refutation of modern Roman doctrine,

slandered as Romanizers by men who do not possess half their knowledge, and in a still less degree, their humility and piety. If a preacher were to speak of the Lord's Supper in a style which commended itself to Zwingle, he would very likely be slandered as a Romanizer. (See 29 8-11.)

110. Gaudentius then goes on to explain in what manner the body of the lamb ought to be eaten. This he considers should be derived from the lesson itself. (Ex. xii. 8-11.) Of this he says, that there are two spiritual meanings, the one which he explains, is that with which we are more especially concerned, viz., how Christ's body is to be eaten in the Lord's Supper, and how that takes place will be best seen as given in his own words. (19 5, 6.) Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey would persuade their readers that the phrase, 'This is my body,' must be understood as literally as the phrase, 'The word was 'God' (34 18; 35 69), and that the eating must be by the natural mouth, and the thing to be eaten the real body of Christ, which was born of Mary, and crucified on the cross. (34 6; 35 71.) Is it conceivable that if Gaudentius had had the remotest conception of such an eating, and of such a thing to be eaten, he would not have given the neophytes some intimation of the same, especially as he was explaining to them the mysteries or secrets of the Lord's Supper in the absence of the uninitiated; whereas he repeatedly insists on the eating of Christ's flesh as spiritual, as our Lord Himself explained in the sixth of St John, and that to eat Christ's body, is to eat what is revealed respecting him in the entire body of the Scriptures.

111. In coming to a close of the part of Scripture which he had undertaken to explain spiritually, he remarks, 'But 'the noble lesson set before you closes what it had said with 'this most worthy end; "For it is the Lord's Passover." "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God"! "It is," saith he, "the Lord's Passover: "that is, the passing over of the Lord,' &c. (19 7.) Here, beyond all question, he regards the words in which Moses, by divine authority, instituted the Passover, as being perfectly analogous to the words of institution in which Christ instituted the Christian Passover. He states, 'For what we have above

‘explained generally, as to eating the flesh of the Lamb, we must observe especially in tasting these same mysteries of the ‘Lord’s passion,’ &c. (19 8.) Again, he explains the eating to be spiritual, and by way of confirming or applying what he had already said respecting eating the flesh of the Lamb, he yet further says, ‘And therefore we are bidden to eat in the ‘mysteries, the Head of His Divinity, together with the feet ‘of His incarnation, and the inward parts; that we may believe all things alike, as they have been delivered.’ (19 9.) He concludes the whole by showing that the mysteries or consecrated elements, signify or represent the real communion of believers as the body of Christ with their Head and with one another. (19 14.)

112. We come now to consider Augustine’s addresses to neophytes—those who had recently been baptized, in which, if anywhere, we ought to find the Paschasian doctrine of the real presence as held by Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey. In a special discourse, explanatory of ‘the sacrament of the Lord’s Table,’ he, in addressing the communicants, distinctly says to them, ‘If ye have well received, ye are what ye have ‘received; for the apostle says, “We being many, are one “bread and one body.” He so explains the sacrament of the ‘Lord’s Table.’ (21 126.) Here Augustine explains the sacrament of the Lord’s Table so as to represent that believers being made bread are one body with Christ. He then shows how by the sacraments, Baptism and Chrism, they were openly made bread, which is the body of Christ. Thus he says, ‘And ye *were made* bread which is the body of Christ.’ (21 126.) Of course, this word, ‘made,’ must not be understood too literally. The same word we have seen is used in another form by Gaudentius. (19 4. See secs. 71 and 108 above.) He further intimates that the chief signification of the consecrated elements is the union of believers with Christ, which, with Augustine, was the object of the Eucharistic signs as we have already noticed. (Ch. xi. 80-103.) Like Cyril, he cautions those just initiated, lest they should regard the consecrated bread as common. Dr Pusey, in order that his readers might note well that Cyril represented the bread as no longer common, simple, or mere bread, expressed these defining words in

italics, (15 11 ; 35 37.) and he and the Papists would have it to be inferred that the bread became so uncommon by consecration as to be whole Christ, God and man and that whoever received the one received the other also. The reader should note well how Augustine regarded the bread after consecration. He addresses the new communicants thus, 'Let 'not that appear common to thee which thou seest. What 'thou seest passes away ; but that which is signified is invisible, does not pass away, but remains, Lo it is received, it 'is eaten, it is consumed. Is the Church of Christ consumed ? 'Are the members of Christ consumed ? Never.' (21 127.) We are not to infer from this that the Church of Christ is really in the bread, and each member in its entirety, body, soul, and spirit. No more ought it to be inferred from the like phraseology elsewhere used by Augustine that whole Christ, God, and man, is in the consecrated bread, yet Dr Pusey does make this inference, and from the following passage, 'And when we eat we do not make Christ into parts, 'indeed it is so done in the sacrament. . . . In parts Christ 'is eaten, and He the whole remaineth entire. By parts He 'is eaten in the sacrament, and He the whole remaineth entire 'in heaven.' (21 139.) Here, beyond all question, Augustine substantially affirms the same things of Christ's body of believing people as he does 'of Christ's body. The former is eaten and is consumed, and is eaten, and is not consumed ; the latter is not made into parts, and is made into parts, and by parts is eaten in the sacrament, and the whole remaineth entire. Augustine most certainly distinguished between the sacrament and the reality of the sacrament. In neither case is the reality located in the sacramental sign, so that what is here affirmed of the sacramental sign cannot be affirmed of the reality, and what is affirmed of the reality cannot be affirmed of the sacramental sign. Chrysostom has spoken of Christ's being broken in the sacrament, which Dr Pusey has adduced as a proof of the real presence of Christ in the consecrated bread. The passage is as follows, 'Chrysostom remarks, how it could not be said of the cross, 'but is true of the Holy Eucharist. "For a bone of Him," 'it saith, "shall not be broken," but that which he suffered 'not on the cross, this He suffers in the oblation for thy sake,

‘and submits to be broken that He may fill all men.’ (35 4; 22 20.) But this is a proof rather of the real absence of Christ’s body in the consecrated bread than of its presence, for Christ’s real body, as we have seen, is not in reality broken or made parts of, but the sacrament or sign of it only. Another striking instance of the absolute unreality of that which Dr Pusey and his fellow Paschasians contend for as being real in the consecrated elements is from Theodoret, who says, when speaking of Christ, ‘Where Thou art sacrificed unsacrificed, ‘and divided undivided, and expended remaining unspent.’ (23 13.) To use Theodoret’s own words, and to apply them exactly as he does, the ‘type,’ ‘symbol,’ ‘image,’ or ‘antitype,’ of Christ’s body ‘is sacrificed,’ ‘is divided,’ ‘is expended,’ but Christ the ‘reality’ or ‘archetype,’ not being in the ‘type’ or ‘image,’ &c., He ‘is unsacrificed’ ‘undivided,’ and ‘unspent.’ Had these three illustrious Fathers, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, had any such notions of the real presence as taught by Romanists, Romanizers, and High Anglicans, they could not have expressed themselves thus. We cannot but notice how very unfairly Dr Pusey has treated the testimony of Augustine in both passages. In the first (21 126) he did not quote sufficient to give Augustine’s meaning. Stopping before Augustine had completed the thought he intended to express, the reader could have no other impression than that he was speaking of the body of Christ, whereas he was really speaking of Christ’s body of true believers, and was showing that that was the sacrament of the Lord’s Table. The most important part, too, of the discourse respecting the communicant consuming the consecrated bread, and not consuming any part of the body of true believers, he has omitted. (21 127.) In the second passage (21 139) he has very much obscured the sense and perplexed the reader by translating the word standing in the place of Christ by the word ‘it,’ instead of the word ‘Him.’ Dr Pusey surely must know how important that part of Augustine’s testimony has been as an argument against the doctrine of Paschasius from the time of Berenger, about the year 1000, to the present time.

113. Another passage, in a discourse of Augustine’s, Dr Pusey has treated exactly after the same manner as the first

of the two noticed above. Of this discourse, (21 135), he has quoted as much as is calculated to give his readers the impression that Augustine is speaking of Christ's body that was born of Mary and crucified on the cross as being in the bread, whereas he is really speaking of Christ's body of true believers. We here begin at that part of Augustine's discourse where Dr Pusey left off. 'If then ye wish to understand the body of Christ, hear the apostle saying to the faithful, "Ye are the body of Christ and his members." If therefore ye are the body of Christ and his members, the mystery of yourselves is placed upon the Lord's Table; ye receive the mystery of yourselves. To that which ye are, ye answer Amen, and by answering subscribe to it. For you hear "The body of Christ," and you answer "Amen." Be a member of Christ's body that your Amen may be true. Why therefore in the bread? Let us here say nothing of our own, let us constantly hear the apostle himself, who, when he was speaking of that sacrament, said, "We being "many are one bread and one body,"' &c. (21 136.)

114. We want to know in what light the Fathers regarded the bread after it had been set apart from a common to a sacred purpose, and looking into their discourses where they fully and unreservedly, though often more rhetorically than accurately, explain all that relates to this point, we find what is really fatal to the doctrine of Paschasius on the real presence in regard to its being a doctrine of antiquity. If Augustine had anywhere in his writings spoken as distinctly of the consecrated bread being the body of Christ which was born of Mary, &c., and of that body being in the bread, as he here speaks of the bread being Christ's body of true believers, and of that body being in the bread, and had been silent on this last point as Dr Pusey and Romanists misrepresent him by withholding his testimony, then it must be confessed that that heresiarch Paschasius, Dr Wiseman, and Dr Pusey would be true disciples of Augustine, and that that greatest theologian of all the Fathers was himself a superstitious heretic, judged of in the light of the plain teaching of Holy Scripture; for we hold by that teaching rather than by any teaching of the Fathers, even though they were unanimous in the same, and

even if we did hold by them, and did so honestly, even then, according to the frequently recorded sentiments of Augustine, we should do none otherwise. 'If,' says he, 'there be a question concerning Christ or His Church, or any other matter appertaining to our faith or practice, I say not if we, who are by no means comparable to him who said, "Though we," but I do say certainly what he goes on to subjoin, "or an angel from heaven preach," anything to you beside what ye have received in the Scripture of the law and the gospel, "let him be accursed."' (*Contra. Lit. Pet. Don.*, lib. iii. c. vi., tom. vii. p. 127.)

115. A question was mooted more than a hundred years after this, whether a believer in Christ could be saved who had died without receiving the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, since Christ himself had said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." To this Fulgentius gives answer to the effect that believers are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ before they receive them in the Eucharist, and after having given proofs of this (21 131-133) he reasons thus, 'Therefore how can it be that he who becomes a member of the body of Christ does not receive that which he becomes? . . . Which also we well know that the holy Fathers without hesitation believed and taught. The blessed Augustine also made a very excellent sermon on this point, also suited for the edification and instruction of the faithful, which entire sermon I prefer to subjoin to my epistle.' (21 134.) Then follows the sermon, which we have given in full, (21 135-137), and the concluding remarks of Fulgentius, (21 138), which the reader should note well, as he distinctly maintains that in the sense in which Christ required His flesh and blood to be eaten, when He said, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have in you,' in that sense the devout communicant eats the flesh and drinks the blood before coming to the Lord's Table, where none other than the same flesh can be eaten and the same blood drunk, and also eaten and drunk in the same sense.

116. The testimony of this same Fulgentius is cited by Bertram and commented upon by him against Paschasius, as may be seen 25 55-57, and from which it may be concluded,

that, if Paschasius taught the truth, Fulgentius, a leading man in the early part of the sixth century, must have been awfully in error.

117. We have yet one other passage to cite, which also forms no part of Dr Pusey's 400 pages of quotations from the Fathers; it is from Augustine, as quoted with approval by Bede, and is given **24 28**, which the reader is requested to note well. Thus Augustine, and in his words Bede, say, 'Because Christ hath suffered for us He hath commended 'unto us in this sacrament His own body and blood, which 'also He hath even made us ourselves. For we also have 'been made His body; and through His mercy we are what 'we receive. . . . You have, as it were, come to the cup of 'the Lord, and there ye are on the table, and there ye are in 'the cup, &c.' This and the other passage (**21 135-137**) just noticed, are cited by Bede from Augustine, as explanatory or illustrative of certain texts of Scripture under which they are placed, as may be seen **24 26, 28**. In connection with the first citation he gives the very words of Fulgentius with approval, (**24 27**.) and thus, in the seventh century, avows his belief, 'that every one of the faithful is made a partaker 'of the Lord's body and blood. . . . before he eats that 'bread and drinks that cup,' and should a believer die before he eats that bread and drinks that cup in the Eucharist, 'he 'surely is not deprived of the benefit and participation of that 'sacrament, since he himself has obtained this, which that 'sacrament signifies.' (**24 27**.) How Bertram cited and applied the first passage from Augustine against Paschasius as we now do against his disciples, may be seen **25 58-61**. And how Rabanus Maurus cited the second passage from Augustine as given by Bede, may be seen **26 13**.

118. Nothing could be more fatal to the doctrine of the real presence, as held by Paschasius and his disciples, than this teaching of Augustine, as cited, confirmed, illustrated, and applied by Fulgentius in the sixth century, Bede in the seventh, and Bertram and Rabanus Maurus in the ninth century. From the whole of the evidence now adduced explanatory of the sacraments, and especially of the object and use of the consecrated elements of the Eucharist, we learn that if these

elements are the seat of a real presence at all, it is not that of the body of Christ which was born of Mary, &c., but rather that of the whole body of believers ; but no one pretends that there is such a presence in the elements as this latter, and surely no one ought to pretend that there is such a presence as the former.

119. It is important to notice before we leave this point that the Fathers do not speak of the Divinity of Christ in the consecrated elements. Theodoret has correctly said that the consecrated elements are 'symbols' of that which is truly 'a body.' (23 43.) That the Lord 'when He had taken and had distributed to the disciples, He said, "this is my body," showing the 'type of the passion, He did not therefore call to mind His 'Divinity.' (23 48, 49.) Again he says, 'The Lord Himself 'promised to give not His invisible nature but His body for the 'life of the world.' (23 50.) Doubtless the elements, as symbols, rather related to the humanity of Christ than His Divinity, and as the consecrated elements, according to the teaching of the Fathers related to the whole body of Christ, including his body of believing people, we should not expect that the supreme Divinity of the Lord Jesus would be among those things which are signified or represented by the consecrated elements. It is assumed by Dr Pusey and Roman Catholics generally and correctly so, that where the human nature of Christ is, there will be His Divinity also. But the Fathers, as we have already considered, speak of Christ's humanity as absent from the present world until He comes again a second time ; and they never speak of His Divinity being located in the consecrated elements. See chapter ix. 4, 5, 72, 73, 78-81.

120. The *sursum corda*, the lifting up of the heart to the Lord, as given in the early rituals, precludes the idea of there being any such presence in the consecrated elements. Thus Cyril, in his fifth lecture on the Christian mysteries, treating on the communion service, says to the newly baptized, 'The priest cries aloud, "Lift up your hearts." For truly ought we 'in that most awful hour to have our heart on high with God, and 'not below, thinking of earth and earthly things. The priest then, in 'effect, bids all in that hour abandon all worldly thoughts or household cares, and to have their heart in heaven with the merciful God. 'Then ye answer, "We lift them up unto the Lord ;" assenting to

'him by your avowal. But let no one come here, who with his lips 'can say, "We lift up our hearts to the Lord," but in mind employs 'his thoughts on worldly business.' (15 13.)

This was preparatory to having communion with the Lord Jesus Christ who was above. But whence was this idea of lifting up the heart, or lifting the heart *above* (*ἄνω*) derived? Doubtless from Holy Scripture, where the Christian is taught to 'seek these things which are *above* (*ἄνω*) where Christ 'sitteth on the right hand of God.' (Col. iii. 1.) It is certain that this idea of lifting the heart above, as thus expressed and explained by Cyril, is derived from that portion of Scripture. We have seen that with him, as well as with the Fathers generally, the consecrated elements are not the Lord Jesus Christ, but an antitype or representation of Him, that they are aids to faith, not the object of it, that object being the Lord Jesus Christ who is *above*, and who, as the man Christ Jesus, is not in consecrated bread and wine in thousands of instances in one and the same instant of time, but is in heaven and will be until He come a second time. Meanwhile, however, till He comes, all the members of His body, though numbered by millions, may, through the medium of the divinely appointed symbols of His body and blood at one and the same moment of time have communion with Him by having their hearts above, where He is.

121. Augustine, as a Latin Father, in addressing the very same class of persons, reiterated the very same sentiments, and founded them upon the very same passage of Scripture. He says: 'Observe ye the sacrament in its order. First, after prayer, 'you were admonished to lift up the heart. The members 'of Christ are taught this. For if ye are made the members 'of Christ, where is your Head? The members have a Head. 'If the Head had not gone before, the members would not 'follow. Whither went your Head? What do you read in 'the symbol (Creed)? "On the third day He arose from "the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand "of the Father." Our Head, then, is in Heaven. There- 'fore, when it is said, "Lift up your heart," you respond, "We lift it up to the Lord." And you do not ascribe this 'very heart which you lift up to the Lord to your own

‘strength, because to lift up the heart is the gift of God : ‘ then, when the people have responded, “We lift up our ‘ “heart to the Lord,”’ &c. (21 126, 127.) If it should be said that Augustine here rather founds the statement respecting the lifting up of the heart upon the Creed, than upon the words of Scripture, the answer is, Cyril actually cites the very text as a proof that Christ sits *above* at the right hand of the Father, and no other text could be cited for such a proof in which the word *above* occurs either from the original Greek or the Latin version except Col. iii. 1. But Augustine actually connects the phrase in question and the text together, so as to make it plain that, in his judgment, the text gave rise to the phrase. Thus, in another part of his writings, after stating what is said in the sacrament of the faithful respecting the lifting up of the heart, he goes on to say, ‘That the heart may ascend and “may taste the ‘ “things which are *above* (*sursum*), where Christ is sitting ‘ “at the right hand of God.”’ (*De Dono Persev. ad Pros.*, lib. ii. cap. 13, tom. vii. p. 564,) In another place he says, ‘If thou hast not earthly lusts, and hast not in vain uttered ‘the response, “Lift thy heart *above* (*sursum*),”’ &c. “If ye ‘ “be risen with Christ,” saith the apostle to believers, “seek ‘ “ye those things which are *above* (*sursum*), where Christ is ‘ “sitting at the right hand of God ; taste ye those things ‘ “which are *above* (*sursum*), not which are upon the earth.”’ (*Enar. in Psalm*, xcvi. (xcvii.), tom. viii., p. 444.) Jerome could not have believed that Christ was located in the consecrated elements, or he could not have spoken as follows ; ‘Let us receive from Him *above* (*sursum*) the cup of the ‘New Testament, and keeping there with Him the Passover, ‘&c.’ (18 20.)

122. This lifting the heart above to the Lord at the right hand of God has ever formed part of the ritual of the Eucharist since the time of Cyprian, and is retained in our church at the present day. Is it conceivable that these Fathers who thus employed the phrase respecting lifting the heart above to the Lord, believed that, in two or three minutes after, He would be really and actually in the hands of a man elevated above his head to be gazed upon and worshipped by the beholders,

or to be placed upon a table of wood, or altar of stone, as upon a throne, for the same purpose? Members of the Roman Catholic Church teach this incredible doctrine, and so do Dr Pusey, Mr Makonochie, and many other members of the Protestant and Evangelical Church of England. This modern and ridiculous, if not profane, performance, is well described by Becon, chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer:—

‘This done, ye fall to crouching and beholding the little cake and chalice; and speaking a few little good words in Latin, ye bless and cross wonderfully the cake and chalice, as though they were haunted with some ill spirits. While ye are thus blessing, the boy, or parish clerk, rings the little sacry bell, which biddeth the people lay all things aside now, and *lift up their heads*, behold their Maker, kneel down and worship their Lord God, which Sir John shall straightways make with as much speed as may be, and show him unto them above his head. Before it was *sursum corda*, “Lift up your hearts” unto the Lord; but now is *sursum capita* come in, “Lift up your heads,” and look upon your Maker between the priest’s hands, with his back turned toward you . . . Come off, kneel down, look up, knock your breast. This is the Lord thy God. Let us fall down and worship him. O insufferable idolatry! Notable is the doctrine of the Nicene Council, which commandeth that we shall not direct our minds downward to the bread and cup, but lift them up to Christ by faith, &c.’ (*The Displaying of the Popish Mass. Works* vol. iii., pp. 266, 267.)

123. Perhaps one of the most able, competent, and impartial witnesses upon this point, is Erasmus, a member of the Roman Church. Few men, if any, could have known the writings of the Fathers better than he, and of this localized presence in the consecrated elements, he speaks thus:

‘For in olden times the people did not run to see that which the priest shows, but with bodies prostrate on the ground, and with minds uplifted to heaven, they gave thanks to Christ their Redeemer who washed us with His own blood, and redeemed us by His death. As Christ in that sacrament is under the mode or condition (*sub ratione*) of food and drink, that He should be received with the greatest purity of mind; not that He should be showed, or carried about in plays, and public pageants, or be carried about the fields on horseback. That in no wise is in accordance with ancient precedent, but in this thing the foolish affections of the people have been too much served and obeyed. Some seem to themselves to be very devout, if, as often as the priest suffers them to behold the body of Christ they run to him on every side and with fixed eyes looking intently. How much more holy were it with the publican

‘to keep at a distance from the chancel, and with body prostrate on the ground, with the mind to worship the crucified One. No man is so foolish as to worship the human for the divine nature of Christ, or as to worship bread and wine for Christ.’ (*De Amab. Eccles. Concord. Enarr. Psalm. lxxxiii., Opera tom. v. cols. 502-504.*)

124. We come to the certain conclusion that the Fathers did not consider that the elements of bread and wine by consecration, were made into, or really became Christ’s body and blood, but by that act became antitypes, representations, or figures of them and equally so of Christ’s body of believing people; and that in holding communion with the man Christ Jesus it was with Him above and not with Him as being actually and really located in the bread and wine.

125. Another point in connection with the consecrated elements to be noticed is, that the Fathers did not consider that they were so changed by the act of consecration as to become ‘indivisibly’ by nature that which they represented or signified, that when Christ said, ‘This is my body,’ they did not understand Him to say that the bread was as literally His body as, ‘the Word was God,’ as Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey contend. (34 18; 35 69.) The Word was so God, and God was so the Word, as to be indivisibly one. But bread was so the body of Christ as to be in its nature and properties bread still. This the Fathers distinctly maintained, as appears in their refutations of the Appollinarian and Eutychian heresies, in which it was held that Christ had but one nature, the human not being distinct from the Divine, or rather being absorbed in it. These heretics alleged the sacramental phraseology of the Eucharist in favour of their notion; some of the Fathers, however, maintained that that phraseology did not favour, but refute their notion. Hence Theodoret adduced elaborate proofs to show that the image, and that of which it was an image, were not really in nature and substance one, as the Eutychians maintained Christ was. How Theodoret spoke and reasoned on this point may be seen 23, 38, 44, the chief part of which evidence has already been considered. (Sec. 38.) He especially shows that a type is not the reality, but that between these two there is an absolute distinction of which he gives ample proofs, especially the case that the images of a king do not possess whatever belongs to the original (23 42.)

Again he shows that the consecrated elements are symbols of a real body, and that as the symbols are images there must be archetypes of them. He concludes therefore that the divine mysteries, that is the consecrated elements, are antitypes of a real body, and that the Lord's body is a body still, and is not changed into the nature of the Godhead. (23 43.) The Eutychian, from the change effected by the consecration of the elements, would illustrate the change of the Lord's body into another nature. But he is answered that the symbols depart not from their own nature, for in that respect they are the same after as before consecration. 'Compare, then, the image 'with the archetype and thou wilt see the likeness. For it 'is necessary that the figure should be like the reality.' (23 45.) What can be more plain than that the image—consecrated bread—is not the reality or archetype. The Eutychian still argues that as 'the symbol changes its former name, and 'is no longer what it was called before, but is entitled, body; 'so then the reality must be called God.' He is answered that 'the archetype, or reality, is named not only body, but 'also bread of life. So the Lord Himself entitled it.' (23 46.) Here let it be well observed that the consecrated bread called the body of Christ, is not the reality, but only an image, type, symbol, or antitype of Christ's real body, and of Him as the Bread of life. Theodoret, however, in common with the Fathers generally believed that the type was adorable and holy and saving, and therefore whatever the Eutychian might think of the Archetype or reality it could not be despicable and mean as he pretended. (23 47.)

126. The present disciples of Paschasius are very zealous in proclaiming their belief that whole Christ, God and man, is in the consecrated elements. This learned and illustrious Father did not believe that either the Man Christ Jesus, or Jehovah Christ, was really in the consecrated elements. He teaches that 'the human nature was given for 'us by the divinity. "For the bread," He says, "which I "will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the "world." (23 24.) He repeats the same sentiment (23 41) with the addition, 'For the Lord also, when He took the 'symbol, did not say, "This is my divinity," but, "This is my

“body,” and again, “This is my blood.” Again he states, ‘But the Lord Himself promised to give, not His invisible nature, but His body for the life of the world. For, He saith, “The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.” And when delivering the divine mysteries (consecrated elements) He took the symbol and said, “This is my body which is given for you.” And nowhere, in discoursing of His passion, did He mention the impassible Godhead.’ (23 50 and 51.) Again, in a direct answer to the Eutychian, after showing that the gift of the flesh was the munificence of the divinity, he proceeds to show not what was made actually and really present, as Paschasians maintain, but what was called to mind in the Eucharist. He states, ‘When He had taken and had broken, and had distributed to the disciples, He said, “This is my body which is given,” or according to the apostle, “broken for you,” and again, “This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many.” Showing the type of the passion, He did not therefore call to mind His divinity, but His body and blood.’ (23 48, 49.) Most assuredly, if Romanists, Romanizers, and High Anglicans are orthodox, on the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, then this most able and learned commentator of the early Christian church was a downright heretic.

127. Chrysostom is another witness whom we shall examine upon this subject. Having also to answer a similar class of heretics who taught that the human nature of Christ was changed into the divine, he, like Theodoret, had to show that the case of the Eucharist neither illustrated nor confirmed such a notion, but refuted it. He states his argument thus, ‘For as we call the bread, before it is sanctified, bread; but when divine grace has, through the intervention of the priest, sanctified it, it is set free from the name bread, and thought worthy to be called the Lord’s body, although the nature of bread remains, and we proclaim not two bodies, but the one body of the Son; so here too, the divine nature having come to indwell in the body, they have together formed one Son, one Person.’ (22 39.) Here he shows that although bread after consecration ceased to be called bread, and was thought worthy to be called the Lord’s body, it

nevertheless was real bread still, as the bread became by consecration associated sacramentally with the Lord's body, it was considered worthy to be called the Lord's body. So the human nature being united with the divine, was called by the same common name 'Christ' and 'The Word,' but by being so called the human nature did not cease to be what it really was, any more than bread did when consecrated and called Christ's body. The reader should bear in mind that Chrysostom is not here speaking of Christ's real body, but of His sacramental body, that is, the image or type of it as Theodoret did whose sentiments we have just considered.

128. Another writer, whom we shall consider, though not one of our chosen witnesses, is deserving of special notice. It is Gelasius, a bishop of Rome, who lived in the sixth century, and, like Theodoret, vindicated the two natures of Christ from the sacramental phraseology of the Eucharist. He says—

'That the mystery [of the two natures] originated from the beginning of the blessed incarnation Holy Scripture testifies, by saying, "Wisdom hath built for herself a house," supported by the solidity of the sevenfold Spirit which ministers the sustenance of Christ's incarnation, by which we are made partakers of the divine nature. 'Certainly the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we receive are holy things, so that through them we are made partakers of the divine nature; and yet the substance or nature of bread and wine do not cease to be there still; and certainly the image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries. It is therefore plainly enough showed unto us, that we must think that to be in the Lord Christ which we profess, celebrate, and take in His image (in the sacrament), that is to say, that, as they go into this divine substance, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, and yet remain still in the reality of their nature; so likewise that very principal mystery [that of the two natures], whose operation and power they truly represent to us, those things remaining whereof it properly consists, they show that one Christ, because He is whole on all points and true, doth remain.' (*Adver. Eutych. et Nestor. in Mug. Bib. Vet. Patr.*, tom. v. pars iii. p. 671.)

129. This, with the other two citations on this point, is completely destructive of the doctrine of transubstantiation; but there is that in it which is most likely to alarm a devout Protestant, who has an instinctive dread of Romanism, especially if he is not acquainted with the style in which the

Fathers speak of the sacraments. But its strength on the side of Romanism is no stronger than its weakest part, and that is no stronger than Zwinglianism as taught by Zwingli himself. We have not the remotest hint of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, but the elements are spoken of as sacraments, that is, sacred signs, of the body and blood of Christ, and as being certainly 'the image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ.' It is true that, like other Fathers, he speaks in a very exalted style of the consecrated elements, calling them a 'Divine substance,' but by anticipation he kept within the rule laid down by Zwingli, viz.: 'That we are so to venerate and worship sacraments as signs and symbols of sacred things, not as if they were the very things of which they are the signs.' (29 13.) Readers not acquainted with the style in which the Fathers write should bear in mind that the promise of mercy, the grace of God, our faith in Christ, God's word, and the holy sacraments, which are the aids and helps of our faith, are frequently, if not commonly, represented by ancient Christian writers as a substance. Tertullian speaks of the sacrament of Baptism as a divine substance. He says, 'One who is not trusted with earthly substance is trusted with divine; that is, Baptism, as the context shows. (*De Bap.*, cap. xviii., p. 225.) No one pretends that, in the sacrament of Baptism, the consecrated water is really the substance of that which it represents or signifies; and there need be no such pretensions in regard to the sacrament of the Eucharist. That Gelasius himself did not, by calling the consecrated elements a divine substance, intend to convey the idea that they were really the body and blood of Christ, as Romanists and Dr Pusey believe, is certain from the fact that he calls them 'the image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ.' If he had believed the consecrated elements really to have been the body and blood themselves, he certainly could not have called them an image and likeness thereof, which would have been incongruous in the extreme. Gelasius says: 'We must think that to be in the Lord Jesus Christ which we profess, celebrate, and take in His image;' that is, the representation or commemoration of Him in the sacrament. We cannot

understand the full meaning of this statement unless we know the exact ritual which was employed by Gelasius. In a Latin edition of an early ritual connected with the name of St James, we have, as a portion, what here follows: ‘*The Priest*: Do this in remembrance of me, for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the death of the Son of man, and confess His resurrection, until He come. *The Deacons say*: We believe and confess. *The people*: O Lord, we show thy death, and we confess thy resurrection.’ We may presume that this would be the substance of what Gelasius would profess and celebrate; and nothing could be more fatal to the opinion which he had to refute, viz., that Christ had but one nature, which was divine, and exclusive of the human. He says truly, ‘that through the consecrated elements we are made partakers of the divine nature.’ But it would be very wrong to conclude from this that there is no other way of becoming partakers of the divine nature except through the sacrament of the Eucharist, for such a conclusion would be contrary to all antiquity. Believers are made partakers of the Divine nature by receiving Christ’s body and blood, but, according to Scripture and all antiquity, this participation is by no means confined to the Eucharist.

130. Dr Wordsworth, the Bishop of Lincoln, in his *sacramental* interpretation of the sixth of St John, which is a plain contradiction of all the great divines of his own Reformed Church, certainly of all of the sixteenth century, and of subsequent divines, such as Hooker, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Hall, Bishop Taylor, Bishop Gibson, Waterland, and Dean Goode, gives in substance the passage from Gelasius now under consideration, and on the same page says, ‘Let all hearken to Christ, who says, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ye have no life in you.” They cannot taste that life which is in holiness and felicity, who do not receive the Son of man in the Holy Communion.’ Such a statement, placed almost in juxtaposition to the citation from Gelasius, might well lead the reader to conclude that the only way in which there can be a participation of the divine nature or of the incarnation of Christ, for that is what Gelasius understands by the phrase, is in the Holy Communion, and thereby

greatly deceive him. For such a notion is not only contrary to Holy Scripture, but to the general teaching of the Fathers. It is unnecessary to repeat here what we have stated in other parts of this volume. (See ch. vii. 44, 45, and secs. 115-118 of this ch.)

131. Gelasius himself represents the incarnation of Christ as our sustenance. Thus he says, as we have quoted above, 'The sevenfold Spirit which ministers the sustenance of Christ's incarnation, by which we are made partakers of the Divine nature.' He does not here necessarily refer to a Eucharistic participation. Elsewhere in the same discourse, on the two natures of Christ, he says, 'They themselves, I say disdain the name of nature, when God Himself had not disdained to be called by His preachers by the name of His own nature; as the blessed apostle Peter in his epistle said, when he preached the mystery [that is, of the two natures] of the Lord Christ; "That by these things," said he, "ye may be partakers of the divine nature."' (*Ibid.* p. 670.)

132. The simplest view to be taken of the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, is that of transubstantiation, and is, in fact, what Paschasius, the chief inventor of the doctrine, at first taught, and is now generally held by both the Latin and the Greek Churches. Moreover, the doctrine propounded in this form is attended with fewer difficulties, and is more easy of belief. Beyond all question the teaching of the above three witnesses is singularly fatal to the doctrine presented in that form, and in fact to the Paschasian doctrine of the real presence, whether the mode of the presence is defined or undefined.

133. This is the place to state more especially the doctrine of the Fathers respecting sacrifice. That all of them commonly employed sacrificial words and phrases in connection with the Lord's Supper is quite certain. Although no Father ever appears to have said plainly that 'Do this' means 'sacrifice this' in any proper sense, yet the phrase was employed in relation to a spiritual sacrifice, and that the whole eucharistic service was regarded as a spiritual sacrifice is evident from the writings of the Fathers. Sacrificial phraseology is of frequent occurrence in the New Testament,

which neither Romanist nor Ritualist could interpret as relating to a material sacrifice, as they do the like phraseology of the Fathers. Thus in the New Testament we have the distinct and literal sacrificial phrase, 'Those high priests to offer up sacrifice.' (Heb. vii. 27.) But the same phrase is employed thus, '*Let us offer the sacrifice of praise.*' (Heb. xiii. 15.) 'Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.' (1 Peter ii. 5.) Here and elsewhere in the New Testament we have the fullest licence for the use of sacrificial language, a licence of which the Fathers generally availed themselves. In their use of such language we are not obliged to consider them as denoting a material sacrifice, any more than the use of such language, as that to which we have referred in the New Testament, denotes a material sacrifice, unless indeed we are given plainly to understand that they really mean a material sacrifice.

134. The Fathers were not merely influenced by the phraseology of the New Testament but by that of the Old also. Regarding the Lord Jesus Christ as being the Word of the Old Testament, and according to Augustine, as having descended to the particles of our sounds, as He descended to assume the infirmity of our body, (21 64, see also ch. xi. 9-12,) they saw or thought they saw a force and meaning in the Old Testament, as if Christ Himself was speaking. Now the portion of Scripture on which, of all others, they base their use of sacrificial language in relation to the Eucharist is the striking prophecy of Malachi. 'For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering, for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts.' (Mal. i. 11.) It must be admitted that the Fathers generally consider that in the Lord's Supper there is a true and real sacrifice. But what do they mean by a true and real sacrifice? They certainly do not mean any thing material. Before we give their expositions of the above prophecy, it will be suitable for us to bear in mind what they mean by the word sacrifice. Augustine says a sacrifice is a

divine thing and that the ancient Latins called it by that name. (21 28.) Isidore, Bertram, and Rabanus Maurus explain a sacrifice in the sense of a sacred act, and it may be applied to every holy act of a Christian. (25 23 ; 26 28.)

135. In giving the testimony of the Fathers in regard to their exposition and application of the above prophecy we shall take them in chronological order, and give the passages which we shall cite from them in the order in which they stand in their writings.

136. Justin after citing the prophecy remarks, 'Now God 'receives sacrifices from no one, except through His priests. 'Therefore God, anticipating all the sacrifices which we do 'through this name, and which Jesus the Christ enjoined us 'to do, that is, in the thanksgiving of the bread and of the 'cup, and which are done by Christians in all places throughout 'the world, bears witness that they are well pleasing to Him. ' . . . You assert that God is pleased with the prayers of 'the individuals of that nation then dispersed, and calls their 'prayers sacrifices. Now that prayers and giving of thanks, 'when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and well 'pleasing sacrifices to God, I also admit. For such alone 'Christians have undertaken to do.' (7 4, 5.) Here most certainly Justin and Trypho the Jew regarded prayers as the only perfect and well pleasing sacrifice to God, and these of course are spiritual, and not material. In the ancient Chaldee Targum of Jonathan the passage is translated, or rather paraphrased thus, 'And your prayers shall be as a pure oblation 'before me.' And Eben Ezra himself thinks that is the meaning of the original words, since the inhabitants of the entire globe are to worship Jehovah. This interpretation admits of some illustration, if not of confirmation, from other parts of Scripture. Thus we read, 'Let my prayer be set forth before 'thee (*as*) incense ; and the lifting up of my hands (*as*) the 'evening sacrifice.' (Ps. cxli. 2.) Here doubtless prayer and incense are regarded as equivalent, as also the lifting up of the hands (meaning also prayer) and evening sacrifice. Again in the Revelation, odours or incense are said to be the prayers of the saints. (Rev. v. 8.) The learned Poole in his *Synopsis Criticorum* has correctly stated, in regard to the passage

under consideration, that 'The most ancient Fathers by a 'great consent hold for certain that this is a most clear 'prophecy concerning Christian sacrifice, by which name they 'did not understand the naked sacrament of Christ's body and 'blood, as many think, but the whole sacred and solemn 'action of which that was the principal part.' What we have now to cite will not only confirm this statement, but will also show that the prophecy was regarded as descriptive of all Christian acts of devotion and piety.

137. Irenæus after citing the prophecy, and making some remarks, adds, 'Now John, in the Apocalypse, declares that 'the "incense is the prayers of the saints."' (8 1, 2.) Again on the same prophecy he states, 'John also declares in the 'Apocalypse, "The incense is the prayers of the saints." 'Then again Paul exhorts us "to present our bodies a living 'sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reason- 'able service." And again, "Let us offer the sacrifice of 'praise, that is, the fruit of the lips." Wherefore the 'oblations are not according to the law, the handwriting 'whereof the Lord having blotted out, took away, but accord- 'ing to the Spirit. For we must worship God in spirit and 'in truth. Wherefore also the oblation of the Eucharist is 'not fleshly but spiritual, and thereby clean.' (8 8.)

138. Tertullian, after quoting the prophecy, states, 'For 'that it is not by earthly sacrifices, but by spiritual, that 'offering is to be made to God, we thus read (Ps. li. 2, 14; 'Isa. i. 11.) And thus, as carnal sacrifices are understood to 'be reprobated, so spiritual sacrifices are foretold. . . . But 'of the spiritual sacrifices he adds, "and in every place they 'offer pure sacrifices to my name, saith the Lord.'" (*Adversus Judæos*, c. v., pp. 95, 96.) Elsewhere, after citing the words of the prophet, he explains the pure sacrifice (*sacrificium mundum*) to be 'Such as the ascription of glory, and praise, 'and hymns. Now, inasmuch as all these things are also 'found amongst you, and the sign upon the forehead, and the 'sacraments of the church, and the purities of the sacrifices, '(*munditiæ sacrificiorum*), you ought now to burst forth, and 'declare that the spirit of the Creator prophesied of your 'Christ.' (*Adver. Mar.*, lib. iii. c. 22, p. 399.) In another

place he regards the words of the prophet as ‘meaning simple ‘prayer from a pure conscience.’ (*Ibid.*, lib. iv. c. 1, p. 404.) These three very ancient witnesses, in what they say, as well as in what they do not say, alike condemn Roman and Ritualist sacrificers.

139. Origen freely quotes a portion of the prophecy and remarks upon it as follows, ‘We know that “in every land “sacrifice is offered to His name.” For now that is the ‘time when the true worshippers worship the Father, neither ‘in Jerusalem, nor in mount Gerezim, but in spirit and in ‘truth. God therefore dwells not in a place, nor in a land, ‘but He dwells in the heart. And if God requires a place, a ‘pure heart is His place.’ (*In Gen. Hom.* xiii. 3, tom. viii., p. 247.)

140. Cyprian very distinctly gives us to understand the difference between the temple, the sacrifice, and the priesthood of the Old Testament, and the temple, the sacrifice, and the priesthood of the New Testament. We learn this from three heads of his first book of ‘Testimonies against the Jews,’ which are: ‘15. That Christ should be the house and temple of ‘God, and that the old temple should cease, and the new one ‘should begin. 16. That the ancient sacrifice should be made ‘void, and a new one should be celebrated. 17. That the ‘old priesthood should cease, and a new priest should come, ‘who should be for ever.’ The fifteenth and seventeenth chapters thus headed have a very important bearing upon the subject under consideration, but the sixteenth only relates to the exact point in hand, and is, ‘In Isaiah, “For what purpose “to me is the multitude of your sacrifices, &c.”’ (Isa. i. 11, 12.) Also the forty-ninth Psalm, (l. 13-15, 23.) In the fourth Psalm too, ‘Sacrifice the sacrifice of righteousness, and ‘hope in the Lord.’ (iv. 5.) Likewise in Malachi, ‘I have ‘no pleasure concerning you, saith the Lord,’ &c. (i. 10, 11.) (*Adver. Judæos*, lib. i. tom. i., pp. 19, 25, 26.)

141. In the so-called Apostolical Constitutions we read, ‘On ‘the day of the resurrection of the Lord, that is, the Lord’s ‘day, assemble yourselves together, without fail, giving thanks ‘to God, and praising Him for those mercies God has bestowed ‘upon you through Christ, and has delivered you from

'ignorance, error, and bondage, that your sacrifice may be
'unspotted, and acceptable to God, who has said concerning
'His universal Church, "In every place shall incense and a
'"pure sacrifice be offered unto me, &c."' (*Lib. vii. c., 30,*
tom. i., p. 372.)

142. The testimony of Eusebius is very full and much to
our point. The reader is especially requested to consider it.
(14 3.)

143. Jerome cites a portion of the prophecy and remarks
as follows, "'And in every place incense is offered to God
'"and a pure offering," when the prophetic word is fulfilled,
'when all the ends of the earth shall remember and return
'to the Lord and all the kindred of the Gentiles shall worship
'in His sight.' (*In Esaiam, lib. xiv., tom. v., p. 191.*) Else-
where, after quoting the words of the Prophet, he remarks,
'Which pure oblation without the blood of goats, rams, and
'bulls, was accomplished at the coming of Christ, when the
'desire of all nations comes, and the sun of righteousness hath
'arisen, in whose wings there is healing.' (*In Ezek. lib.*
viii., tom. v. p. 453.) In his commentary on the very pro-
phesy, he states, 'But they may know that to carnal sacrifices
'spiritual sacrifices will succeed, and that by no means the
'blood of bulls and of goats, but incense, that is, the prayers
'of the saints offered to the Lord, and not in Judea, one
'province of the world, nor in Jerusalem one city of Judea,
'but in every place an oblation should be offered; by no
'means impure, as by the people of Israel, but pure as in the
'ceremonies of Christians.' (*In Mal. cap. i., tom. vi., p. 293.*)

144. Gaudentius states, 'But that He appointed the sacra-
'ments of his body and blood to be offered in the form of
'bread and wine, there is a twofold reason. First, that the
'immaculate Lamb of God might deliver a pure sacrifice to
'be celebrated by a purified people, without burning, without
'blood, without broth of flesh, and which should be ready and
'easy to be offered by all.' (19 12.) Of all our witnesses
Gaudentius comes the nearest to what Romanists and Ritualists
require to justify their notions of sacrificing in the Lord's
Supper. But plainly here the celebrators and offerers are the
communicants, and if the reader will take the trouble to

study what we have cited from him, he will be quite certain that although he employs sacrificial language, yet it relates only to what is purely spiritual.

145. Augustine states in his greatest work, on the City of God, ‘We ourselves are God’s best and most excellent sacrifice. This is His city, the mystery of which thing we celebrate in our oblations which are known to the faithful as in the preceding books we have discussed. For that all sacrifices should cease which the Jews offered in shadow of the future, and that the Gentiles from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, should offer one sacrifice as we now see has come to pass, the divine oracles by the Hebrew prophets have proclaimed aloud,’ (*De Civ.* lib. xix. c. 23, tom. v., p. 254.)

In expostulating with the Jews, he says, ‘nor has this been so predicted and fulfilled as to permit you to respond to the prophetic sentiment, for we do not offer flesh with the hands, but we offer praise with the mouth and heart according to that in the Psalm, “Sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise.” Even here he contradicts you who says, “I have no pleasure in you.”’ Then quoting the prophecy in question, he remarks, ‘What do you answer to these things? At length open your eyes somewhat and see, “from the rising of the sun to the going down;” not in one place as was constituted in you, but that in every place the sacrifice of Christ is offered, not to any god, but to Him who has predicted these things, the God of Israel.’ (*Oratio adver. Judæos*, cap. 9., tom. vi., p. 33.) Again in the same prophecy, he remarks, ‘For incense, which in the Greek is “odours,” as John explains in the Apocalypse, is “the prayers of the saints,” God in fact, is He, as is sung in the Psalm. “Who hath called the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof,” to which earth, that is, to which people diffused from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, we would say, “I will take no calves out of thy house. Sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise.” He Himself by that prophet predicting most certainly what would be as having come to pass, says, “From the rising of the sun, even to the going down, my name is great among

“the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my ‘name, and a pure offering.’” (*Contra Leg. et Proph.* lib. i., c. 20, tom. vi., p. 252.) A little earlier in the same treatise we read, ‘Shall I eat the flesh of bullocks? or shall I drink the blood of goats? sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows to the most high.’ And again at the end of the same Psalm, he says, “‘The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me, and there is the way by which I will show him the salvation of God,” which is Jesus Christ Himself which I have mentioned and shown above. But what is more holy than the sacrifice of praise, than the giving of thanks? And whence are greater thanks given to God than for the grace of Himself, through Jesus Christ our Lord.’ (*Ibid.* c. 18, tom. vi., pp. 250, 251.)

146. Chrysostom, after citing the prophecy in question, shows its spiritual application to the Christian Church, and contrasts the Jewish material sacrifices with the spiritual sacrifices of Christians, and enumerates the latter as ten, all of which he shows are spiritual. The citation is too important to abridge. (See 22 1, 2.)

147. Cyril of Alexandria, in his commentary on the text, states:—

‘Openly, therefore, He said to the priests of the Law, that they were against His will, or rather, that in them He had no pleasure, that is, in the shadow and types of sacrifice which they performed, and that their holy things He would not receive. But He pronounced His name to be great and illustrious under the whole heaven, and in every place and nation pure sacrifices and unbloody should be offered to His name, not by those degraded priests, nor yet should spiritual services be offered to Him carelessly, but with diligence and propriety and sanctity by the diligent; and also the sweet odours of spiritual incense, that is, faith, hope, and love, and the renown of good works, so that the life-giving and heavenly sacrifice of Christ be established, by which death is destroyed, and this earthly flesh, obnoxious to corruption, may put on incorruption.’ (*Comment. in Mal.*, cap. 12; *In XII. Prophetas*, col. 1354.)

148. Theodoret, in his commentary on the words in question, states:—

‘For the inhabitants of all lands, on which the rising and setting sun sheds his rays, and everywhere they shall offer incense to me and sacrifice a pure and free-will offering. For they shall know

‘my name and my will, and shall offer due worship. So also the Lord said to the Samaritan woman, “Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, and now is, when ye shall, neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. For God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.” The blessed Paul hath also taught these things. He commands to pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting. And the divine Malachi openly has taught us through these words the piety which now obtains everywhere. For the service of the priesthood has ceased to be confined to a place, but every place is declared suitable for the worship of God, and the slaughter of irrational animals has come to an end, and only the immaculate Lamb is sacrificed [or is consecrated *ιερεῖται*], and the sweet incense is as a symbol of its virtue.’ (*Comment. in Mal.*, cap. 1, tom ii., pp. 1676, 1677.)

149. Fulgentius, in his treatise on the Faith, or whoever may be its author, to Peter the Deacon, in obvious allusion to the prophecy in question, says: ‘Hold most firmly, and have no doubt at all, that the Only-Begotten became incarnate for us, that He offered himself for us, an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour; to whom, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, in the time of the Old Testament, animals were sacrificed, and to whom now, with the Father and the Holy Spirit (with whom there is one Godhead), the holy church, throughout the whole world, ceases not to offer the sacrifice of bread and wine. For, in those carnal victims, there was a typifying of the flesh of Christ, which He himself was to offer for our sins, and of the blood which He was to shed for the forgiveness of sins. But in that sacrifice there is thanksgiving and commemoration of the flesh of Christ, which He offered for us, and of the blood which He shed for us.’ (*De Fide ad Petrum Diac. Bib. Mag. Vet. Patr.*, tom vi., pt. 1, p. 102.)

150. This testimony against modern Paschasian sacrificers cannot be well over-estimated. The above witnesses, as well in what they do not say as what they do say, alike condemn these modern sacrificers, whether Roman, Greek, or Anglo-catholic. Had any one of them had his mind pervaded with the notions common to the disciples of Paschasius, and commonly maintained by his leading disciples Lanfranc, Fulbert, Bellarmine, Stapleton, Gardiner, Dr Wiseman, and Dr Pusey, how very differently he would have written. No

one of this school pretends that the Fathers have given any different interpretation and application of the prophecy from those given above.

151. Cornelius à Lapidè, the most able and best reputed Roman Catholic commentator since the Council of Trent, gives five interpretations of the 'pure-offering.' The first four, however, he rejects. Only two of these are worthy of notice. One is the Jewish interpretation given above; the other is as follows: 'Calvin and heretics, who deny all sacrifice properly so called of the new law, understand a mystical oblation, as for example the worship of God through faith, hope, charity, prayer, invocation, and praise, and also pious works, especially of charity and almsgiving, or of the conversation of the mind. Clarius and Vatablus [both Roman Catholics] admit the same interpretation, which Tertulian, in his fifth book against the Jews, seems to favour, but he is against them in the 22nd chapter of the third book against Marcion, where he explains himself, and by pure oblation he understands the sacrifice of the Eucharist.' Cornelius à Lapidè's own interpretation is.—

'But I say that this "pure oblation" is the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. Whence it appears, contrary to the heretics, that the Eucharist is not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice. It is proved, first, that for oblation the Hebrew is *mincha*, which word, from its origin, signifies any present, gift, oblation, sacrifice, yet by Moses and God is applied to one sacrifice, which properly signifies a corn sacrifice, which was made of flour or bread, and which is described in Leviticus ii. But this *mincha* or corn sacrifice, as appears from Leviticus ii., was a type of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, for in both respects flour is offered and bread; but in the Eucharist is transubstantiated and transmuted into the body of Christ. Since, therefore, the typical and Judaic *mincha* was properly called a sacrifice, it much more follows that the true and Christian *mincha*, namely, the Eucharist, is a true and proper sacrifice. Secondly, the word *pure* intimates that this *mincha* was in itself a pure and holy victim, so that it may always remain pure, even if those offering it are impure. But such only is the Eucharist, in which the victim is Christ himself, the most pure and the Saint of saints.'

152. This really requires neither note nor comment. The reader cannot fail to see how much more nearly the exposition of Calvin and those whom Cornelius à Lapidè calls heretics,

approaches to that of the Fathers as given above, than does his own. That *mincha* may mean a sacrifice made of bread or of flour, and, as such, be a material sacrifice, is not disputed; but that the Fathers did not so understand it in the prophecy in question, is quite certain. Cornelius claims Tertullian to be on his side. The two passages to which he alludes, together with a third, are given above (sec. 138), respecting which the reader is left to his own conclusions. We ask, with Calvin, 'Were we to allow offering and incense [contrary to the Fathers] to be taken here literally, how could '*mincha* offering be the body and blood of Christ? "Oh, "they say, "it is a sacrifice made of bread, and wine was "added. Oh, Christ has thus commanded." But where 'has He said, "sacrifice?" They, again, deny that it is 'bread, for they say that it is transubstantiated into the body 'of Christ [as Cornelius does], now then it is not a sacrifice 'of bread nor of fine flour, for the form only, visible to the 'eyes and without substance, remains as they imagine.' (*Comment. on Malachi*, ch. i. 11.)

153. For Romanists or any others to ascribe such a meaning to the words of the prophet, is gross and outrageous in the extreme, and the interpretation of Cornelius is a fair specimen of modern Roman teaching.

154. The general testimony of the Fathers respecting sacrificing shall now be given, pursuing the same order as before.

155. Romanists and High Anglicans have laid their hands on a passage in the Epistle of Clement of Rome as an instance of sacrificing belonging exclusively to the clergy. It is given 1 4, 5, by a careful examination of which it will be seen that Clement is speaking exclusively of Jewish sacrifices. (See also 1 3.)

156. Barnabas, speaking of the abolishment of the sacrifices of the Law, makes no substitution for them in the Christian dispensation otherwise than that we make an oblation of ourselves, that is of our affections (5 1). He further describes this oblation as 'a heart that glorifieth God that 'made it,' and as being 'of sweet savour to the Lord.' (5 2.)

157. Justin Martyr is very express in speaking of himself

as a layman, and his fellow communicants as 'a high-priestly 'race of God,' citing, at the same time, the text on which the Fathers commonly founded their notion of Christians generally being priests and offering spiritual sacrifices. (7 4.) He then names the sacrifices, and says, 'Now that prayers 'and giving of thanks, when offered by worthy men, are 'the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God, I also 'admit. For such alone Christians have undertaken to do,' &c. (7 5.) In a treatise on the Faith, usually published with the works of Justin, we have, 'The divine Word, to 'whom we continually sacrifice the sacrifice of praise; to 'whom we pour, as unto God, the libations of sincere prayers, 'and sacrifice the sweet smell of our works, making him a 'part of ourselves in daily life, breathing him, praising him 'in all things, our blessed hope, and the giver to us of the 'kingdom of heaven.' (*Expos. Fid.*, p. 306.)

158. Athenagoras, in his 'Plea for the Christians,' admits the charge against them that they do not sacrifice. Thus, he says, 'As to our not sacrificing; the Framer and Father of 'this universe does not need blood, nor the odour of burnt-'offerings, nor the fragrance of flowers and incense, forasmuch 'as He is Himself perfect fragrance, needing nothing either 'within or without; but the noblest sacrifice to Him, is for us 'to know who stretched out and vaulted the heavens, &c. We '“lift up holy hands” to Him, what need has He further of 'a hecatomb? And what have I to do with holocausts, 'which God does not stand in need of? though indeed, it 'does behove us to offer a bloodless sacrifice and “the '“service of our reason.”' (*Ch. xiii., Ante-Nicene Christian Library.*) If this able Christian defender of his brethren knew any thing of the sacrifices of Romanists and High Anglicans he doubtless would have given us an inventory of them and inculcated a use of the same.

159. Irenæus, like Justin, speaks of the accomplishment of the prophecy of Malachi as realized in the Christian Church in the performance of pure spiritual immaterial sacrifices. Thus the incense he explains as being 'the prayers of the 'saints' (8 2.) and he shows like Augustine, that a pure Christian sacrifice is a mental act, sacrificing not sanctifying

a man, but the man sanctifying the sacrifice, adducing the Apostle Paul as an illustration (8 3.) to show how purely mental and spiritual the sacrifices were whether in or out of the Lord's Supper. 'Thus it is, therefore, also His will that we should offer a gift at the altar, frequently, and without intermission. The altar then is in heaven (for towards that place are our prayers and oblations directed), the temple likewise is there.' (8 5.) Again he explains the 'incense and pure offering' of Malachi i. 11, as being exclusively spiritual and as fulfilled 'in the prayers of the saints, the presentation of our bodies a living sacrifice,' and 'the offering of the sacrifice of praise.' (8 8.)

160. Clement of Alexandria says :

'It is not without reason that we honour God in prayer ; and this is the best and holiest sacrifice with righteousness we bring, presenting it as an offering to the most righteous Word. . . . the altar then, that is with us here, the terrestrial one is the congregation of those who devote themselves to prayer, having, as it were, one common voice and mind. . . . For the sacrifice of the Church is the word breathing as incense from holy souls, the sacrifice and the whole mind at the same time unveiled to God. . . . For the sacrifices of the Law express figuratively the piety which we practice . . . wherefore we ought to offer to God, sacrifices not costly, but such as He loves. And that compound incense which is mentioned in the Law, is that which consists of many tongues and voices in prayer, &c.' (*Strom.* vii., pp. 717-719.)

161. Tertullian on this, as on many other points, gives important evidence against our modern sacrificers. He states—

'For prayer is the spiritual victim which has abolished the pristine sacrifices. "To what purposes &c. (Is. i. 11.) What then God "has required, the Gospel teaches." "An hour will come," saith He, "When the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth. For God is a Spirit, and accordingly requires His worshippers to be such." We are the true worshippers and the true priests, who, praying in spirit, sacrifice in spirit, prayer—a victim proper and acceptable to God, which assuredly He has required, which He has looked forward to, for Himself! This victim, devoted from the whole heart, fed on faith, tended by truth, entire in innocence, pure in chastity, garlanded with love, we ought to escort with the pomp of good works, amid psalms and hymns, unto God's altar, to obtain for us all things from God.' (*De Ora.* c. 28.)

162. Origen represents the Christian sacrifice as being of

a pure spiritual nature. He shows that as Christ was with the Prophets, so, according to His own promise, He is with His true disciples. 'Since, therefore, Jesus Christ is present, and He assists and as High Priest is girded and prepared to offer our supplications to the Father, rising by Him let us offer sacrifices to the Father.' (11 42.)

163. Cyprian, in a special letter in relation to the Lord's Supper, commonly uses sacrificial language. He speaks of Jesus Christ as being 'the author and teacher of this sacrifice' (12 2), and states, 'Nor is the sacrifice of the Lord celebrated by a legitimate consecration unless our oblation and sacrifice correspond with His passion.' (12 6.) Again he says, 'For if, in the sacrifice which Christ offered, Christ is alone to be followed, then we ought to obey, and do what Christ did, and which He commanded to be done.' (12 7.) 'And because we make mention of His passion in all sacrifices (for the passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer) we ought to do nothing else than He did.' (12 8.) It is difficult to understand the sacrificial language of Cyprian in any other sense than spiritual. He repeatedly insists that nothing is to be done in the Eucharist but that which Christ did. It has yet to be proved that He in His Supper sacrificed in any material sense. Cyprian, like other Fathers, regarding the prophecy of Malachi as relating to spiritual sacrifices, especially that of the Lord's Supper, very freely expressed his own official acts in imposing sacrificial language. His being by profession a rhetorician may account for his inflated style, which in his own day laid him open to the caution, 'That bishops should be humble.' When put upon his defence by a bishop who gave him the above hint, he represents his priestly acts as being oral. Thus he says, 'If you will give most ample satisfaction to God and His Christ, whom I serve, and to whom with pure and untainted mouth I unceasingly offer sacrifice, as well in persecution as in peace.' (*Epist.* LXVI., tom. ii., p. 169.) He plainly states that 'the passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer,' which generally is understood to mean doing a remembrance of His passion. Thus Chrysostom says, 'We always do the same sacrifice; or rather, we do a remembrance of that

‘sacrifice.’ (22 37.) Theodoret states, ‘We do not offer another sacrifice, but we make the commemoration of that one saving sacrifice.’ (23 33.) Rabanus Maurus enunciates the same sentiments. (26 15.)

164. Lactantius states—

‘Therefore, whoever shall obey all these heavenly precepts, is a worshipper of God whose sacrifices are humility of soul, an innocent life, and acts of goodness. . . . Now, let us say a few things concerning sacrifice itself. . . . Therefore, if any one thinks that God cares for vestments, gems, and other things which are esteemed precious, he plainly does not know what God is. . . . There are two things which ought to be offered, gift and sacrifice; the gift for ever, the sacrifice for time. . . . The gift is integrity of soul; the sacrifice is praise and a hymn. For if God is not seen, then He ought to be worshipped by those things which are not seen. . . . But let us, giving thanks, worship; of this blessing alone is the sacrifice, and rightly, for it is necessary to sacrifice to God by the Word: if so be the Word is God as He Himself has confessed. Therefore the highest form of worshipping God, is praise addressed to God from the mouth of a just man.’ (*Div. Inst.*, lib. vi., cc. 24, 25, pp. 586-589.) ‘I have spoken of righteousness what it should be; it follows that I show, what a true sacrifice of God is, which form of worshipping is most just. No one should think, that either victims or odours, or precious gifts, are desired by God. . . . He does not need earthly lights, who can make the sun to rise with the stars for the use of man. What, therefore, doth God desire from man, except the worship of the mind, which is pure and holy? For those things which are either made with the fingers, or are external to man, are unsuitable, frail, and without favour. This is the true sacrifice, not that which is offered from the chest, but from the heart; not that which is dedicated with the hand, but that which is dedicated with the mind. This is the most acceptable victim, which the soul sacrifices of itself. For of what avail are sacrifices? what incense? what vestments? what gold? what silver? if there is not the pure mind of the worshipper.’ (*Ibid. Epit.*, c. ii., pp. 683, 684.)

165. Eusebius, like Cyprian, applies the language of sacrifice to the Lord’s Supper, but according to his very definite teaching, we are compelled to understand his words spiritually. He says, ‘Christ offered a certain wonderful victim and chosen sacrifice acceptable to the Father for the salvation of all of us, and directed us to offer continually a memorial to God instead of a sacrifice.’ (14 1.) ‘When therefore we, having received that, we ought to celebrate the memory of this sacrifice on the table through the symbols of His body and

'saving blood.' (14 2.) 'The prophetic oracles make mention of these incorporeal and intellectual sacrifices.' (14 3.) 'For since he no longer admitted the bloody sacrifices, &c., prescribed in the Law of Moses, but ordained that they should use bread as the symbol of His own body.' (14 4.) The testimony of Eusebius is most full and decisive as given (14 1-4), the whole of which the reader will do well to consider.

166. Cyril of Jerusalem, after having stated the act of consecration, speaks of that which is consecrated as a '*spiritual sacrifice*.' (15 13.) Dr Pusey has cited the former, but left out the latter part.

167. Ambrose teaches that 'All the sons of the Church are priests, for we are anointed into a holy priesthood, offering ourselves spiritual sacrifices to God.' (17 9.)

168. Jerome, on the words, 'I will bring them into my holy mount, and will make them joyful in my house of prayer, their burnt offerings and their victims shall please me upon my altar; for my house shall be called the house of prayer for all nations,' (Isa. lvi. 7), remarks, 'God says, "The sacrifice of praise hath glorified me."' (Ps. l. 23.) 'And in another place, "Sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise." (Ps. cxvi. 17.) Of these victims and burnt offerings the Lord speaks by the Prophet Hosea, "I desired mercy, and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings," (Hos. vi. 6), which are offered upon the Lord's altar. Which John in the Apocalypse testifies that he saw in heaven, under which were seen the souls of the martyrs. From which one of the Seraphim having taken with the tongs a live coal, brought it to purge the lips of Isaiah. This is the altar and this is the tabernacle, to the likeness of which all things done in Exodus are referred, in which spiritual victims were offered to God.' (*Comment. in Esaiam*, lib. xv., tom. v., p. 208.)

169. We have thus far, for the most part, cited the above witnesses without note or comment, leaving them to speak for themselves. If it be asked, do not the disciples of Paschasius bring evidence more favourable for themselves than this, and better calculated to justify their opinions in regard to sacri-

ficing? We do not know that they do, and we believe the above is substantially inclusive of all that they are accustomed to quote. Bellarmine, the ablest defender of the Paschasian heresy, does not cite anything more. Is it possible that all these Fathers could have believed, as modern Paschasians teach, that at every due celebration of the Lord's Supper Jesus Christ is sacrificed for the living and the dead? Such a doctrine, if true, must be of infinite moment, and one which, if the Fathers had believed, we may be perfectly certain no one of their number could have ignored without being called to account or treated as a heretic. If even a very figurative form of expression might be cited from one of the most rhetorical of the Fathers in proof of a doctrine so vital and important, if true, it would be of no avail if contradicted by any other parts of his writings, or not sustained by them, or if contradicted by the writings of any of his brethren, or not maintained by them. We are positively shut up to the conclusion either that the doctrine was believed by all, or by none. That it could not have been believed by all is certain from the above evidence. We are certain that it could not have been believed by any, and that in fact it was a thing unknown, having not yet been invented. We have certain proof from all the above witnesses of the common doctrine of spiritual sacrifices and spiritual sacrificers. We have no proof of any other kind of Christian sacrifices and sacrificers.

170. We have additional witnesses to adduce. Of these, Augustine is the most important, as on this, as well as on other points in the present inquiry, he has given the most complete evidence of all the Fathers. He says, 'The Lord 'Jesus Christ offered Himself a sacrifice for our sins, and 'commended a resemblance of His sacrifice to be celebrated 'in memory of His passion.' (21 25.) At 21 28 he shows that the real sacrifices, such as the slaying of cattle done by the ancient Fathers of which we read, but do not do, were significant of things performed in us, and concludes thus, 'Therefore a visible sacrifice is a sacrament of an invisible 'sacrifice, that is, it is a sacred sign.' (21 28.) With the Fathers generally, he explains a Christian sacrifice to be immaterial and spiritual, thus he says, 'The sacrifices of God are a broken

'spirit, a broken and a contrite heart,' and shows that to do good and to communicate are sacrifices with which God is well pleased. He teaches that every good work acceptably performed by a Christian is a true sacrifice. He gives a very comprehensive meaning to the word sacrifice, explaining it as '*a divine thing.*' (21 28.) In imitation of which Rabanus Maurus, in the ninth century, in his treatise on the Office of the Mass says, 'That which is consecrated in remembrance of the Lord's passion has been called a sacrifice in the sense of a sacred doing or deed.' (26 28.) Augustine also states that a man consecrated to God and dead to the world is a sacrifice, and that the whole redeemed Church itself is 'a universal sacrifice to God by the High Priest, who also offered Himself in His passion for us in the form of a servant, that we might be the body of so great a Head.' He says, 'This is the sacrifice of Christians, viz., "That we being many are "one body" in Christ, which body the Church celebrates in the sacrament of the altar known to the faithful, where in the same sacrament is shown that in that oblation which it offers, itself is offered.' (21 28.) Let the reader bear in mind that this sacrifice or 'divine thing,' as Augustine calls it, is truly spiritual, and as much concerns the body of true believers as the body of Christ. With Augustine and most of the Fathers, the body of Christ in this connection is always understood to be inclusive of His body the Church. In the sense in which the body of Christ is said to be in the Eucharist, and there offered, in that same sense the body of true believers is there and is offered therein.

171. In another chapter of the same great work of Augustine, we have still more important evidence upon this point. He says, 'Surely they know not that these [visible sacrifices] are so signs of those [services of a pure mind and good will] as sounding words are signs of realities. Wherefore, as in prayer and praise we direct significant words to him to whom we offer the very realities in the heart which we signify; thus sacrificing, we know that we must offer a visible sacrifice on an altar to none but to him, whose invisible sacrifice in our hearts we ourselves ought to be.' (21 29.) In another part of the same work we are told that Christ is both the

Offerer and the Oblation. 'The sacrament of which reality 'He desires to be the daily sacrifice of the church; which, 'since it is the body of Himself the Head, it learns to offer 'itself through him.' (21 30.) Lest Augustine should seem to confound what is commonly spoken of in the Lord's Supper as sacrificial with Jewish sacrifices typical of Christ's sacrifice, or the real sacrifice of Christ Himself, he avoids the use of any sacrificial word. Thus he says, 'The flesh and 'blood of this sacrifice, before the coming of Christ, was promised by sacrifices of resemblances; in the passion of Christ 'it was declared in very truth. After Christ's ascension it 'is solemnized by a memorial sacrament.' (21 42.)

172. Chrysostom has not said much respecting Christian sacrificing. What he has said occurs in one part of his writings, and is given 22 1, 2. Christian sacrifices, as here explained by him, are spiritual sacrifices, various Christian spiritual actions being called by that name. After enumerating the various sacrifices of the law, he represents them as being substituted by one true sacrifice. Those literal sacrifices of the Law he considers to be entirely abolished. He, however, specifies various Christian acts which he calls sacrifices. None of these come under the Law, but are suited to gospel grace, and are without blood, without smoke, without altar, meaning a material or elevated one. 'Hear thou the 'Holy Scripture plainly setting before thee this difference and 'variety.' The Christian sacrifices he enumerates as follows: The first sacrifice is the gift of salvation, which he calls an intellectual and mystical gift; the second, of martyrs; the third, of prayer; the fourth, of a joyful noise; the fifth, of righteousness; the sixth, of alms; the seventh, of praise; the eighth, of contrition; the ninth, of humility; the tenth, of preaching. (22 1, 2.) He gives a short account of each of these, but, as may be seen on consulting the reference, he makes no allusion to any sacrifice such as Romanists and Romanizers claim exclusively for the bishop and presbyter. He especially alludes to one kind of sacrifice, which he confines to them. He asks, 'Dost thou wish to see what kind 'of sacrifices are performed by us? There is also another 'new sacrifice, which is accomplished by preaching of the

'gospel, &c.' (22 2.) Chrysostom claims for the bishop and presbyter rather a preaching office than a priestly one. It is a fact, though rarely if ever mentioned, that the highest office claimed for the bishop and presbyter by the Fathers was that of preaching, and their highest and most honourable titles, as descriptive of office, were 'teacher' and 'preacher.' But in the early age of the church both the office and the titles were restricted to the bishop. Elsewhere, on the words 'Be ye thankful,' he remarks, 'For the best preservation of any benefit is the remembrance of the benefit, and a continual thanksgiving. For this cause even the awful mysteries, so full of that great salvation, which are celebrated at every communion, are called a sacrifice of thanksgiving,' &c. (22 4.) Here, doubtless, Chrysostom expresses the real sentiments of early antiquity as to the sense in which the Lord's Supper was a sacrifice, viz., one of thanksgiving. We have shown elsewhere that the Eucharist or Thanksgiving was an act common to all the communicants. (See secs. 89, 90 above.) Chrysostom, by thus speaking, shows how great a stranger he must have been to the modern notions of Romanists, Ritualists, and High Anglicans, respecting an exclusive clerical priesthood.

173. When Chrysostom, as we have seen, affirms that 'these sacrifices which the church has . . . are without altar.' (22 1), he not only means, not an elevated place, whether with three or any given number of steps, but also not a material or literal one. He, in common with most of the Fathers, called the communion table an altar, literally meaning a place for sacrificing; but as the sacrifices to be offered were immaterial and spiritual, we should infer that the altar must be so also. Assuredly, the sacrifices above described by Chrysostom—and he appears to have included all the Christian sacrifices known to him in that list—could not be offered on any material altar. As little could a sacrifice of thanksgiving, which, Chrysostom informs us, the mysteries of the Eucharist were called, be so offered. Elsewhere he represents the believing poor of Christ's body as an altar on which the merciful man may sacrifice, and he contrasts this altar with the altar of the Eucharist. Thus he says: 'For this altar [that of the

‘Eucharist] is admirable, because of the sacrifice laid upon it; but that, the merciful man’s, not only on this account, but also because it is even composed of the very sacrifice which maketh the other to be admired.’ (22 26.) Here it should be observed that the altar of the merciful man, said to be composed of the very sacrifice which is placed on the so-called altar of the Eucharist, is Christ’s body of believing people. Assuredly this body could not form any material altar, nor could it be said to be placed, in any proper sense, upon a material altar. That the altar of Chrysostom and its correlatives were immaterial and metaphorical admits of additional confirmation from what follows: ‘As there was a great difference between Aaron and Christ, there is an equal difference between us and the Jews. For, behold, we have our victim above, our priest above, our sacrifice above. Therefore, let us offer such sacrifices as can be presented on that altar: no longer sheep and oxen; no longer blood and incense. All these things are abolished, and there is introduced in their stead a rational worship. But what is a rational worship? The things there are offered by the soul, the things that are offered by the Spirit.’ (22 33.)

174. Theodoret speaks about sacrificing the spotless Lamb (23 2), which cannot be otherwise than spiritual. Elsewhere, representing Christ as being the Head of those who offer, he says, ‘For He calls the Church His body, and through it as man He exercises the priest’s office, but, as God He receiveth the offerings.’ (23 14.) Doubtless, this kind of offering is spiritual and invisible. Speaking of the Eucharistic service in connection with typical sacrificing and the real sacrifice of Christ Himself, he avoids the use of any sacrificial word. But this is unaccountable if the sacramental service is really and properly sacrificial as some in comparatively modern times pretend. Thus he says, ‘If, therefore, both that priesthood which is of the Law, hath received an end and the priest who is according to the order of Melchizedek has offered His sacrifice, and has made other sacrifices to be needless, why do the priests of the New Testament perform the mystical or sacramental service? It is plain to those who have been instructed in divine things that we do not offer any other

'sacrifice, but perform the remembrance of that one saving sacrifice. For the Lord Himself commanded us, saying, "Do "this in remembrance of me," and this we do, in order that 'by contemplation we may call to mind the type of the sufferings which He underwent for us,' &c. (23 33.) A more distinct recognition of the One Sacrifice offered once for all, could not well be given, nor a more direct repudiation of anything really sacrificial. This evidence coming as it does from the most distinguished commentator of his age, is an overwhelming testimony against all who would have any other sacrifice than a spiritual one.

175. It is important to notice that the unconsecrated elements in very early times were called by sacrificial names. The bread and the wine with other food were provided by the communicants, which in apostolic and post-apostolic times formed the elements of a social meal followed by the Lord's Supper, the bread and wine of which, were taken from the gifts of the communicants. In more recent times, the feast followed the Eucharist, it having become the general custom, if not the rule of the Church, to celebrate that ordinance fasting. According to Augustine, there was, however, one very important exception in the course of the year, for he says, 'Some have thought good, and that with show of reason, that 'on one fixed day in the year, on which the Lord gave the 'actual Supper, it is lawful that the body and blood of 'the Lord should, as though for a more marked commemoration, be offered and received after eating.' (*Epist. cxviii., ad 'Januarium*, tom. II., p. 213.) The unconsecrated elements provided by the people were called their gifts, oblations, and even their sacrifices. Thus Cyprian says, 'You are rich and 'wealthy; and think you, that you celebrate the Lord's Supper who are altogether negligent of the treasury; (*corboniam*) 'who come to the Lord's Supper without a sacrifice (*sacrificio*), 'and take part of that sacrifice which the poor has offered.' (*De Opere et Elemos.*, tom. I., p. 203.) This kind of sacrifices and sacrificers neither suits Romanists nor Ritualists, for they contend not for a sacrificing laity, but an exclusive, sacrificing clergy. We have shown very fully elsewhere that the early Church regarded all the baptized as priests and as con-

stituting a priesthood, and that bishops and presbyters by virtue of their office, were no more real sacrificers than were any of the baptized laity. (*Whose are the Fathers?* &c., ch. iii., secs. 19-23.)

176. We have positively no evidence in the writings of the Fathers of any exclusive sacrificing clerical priesthood in the Christian Church as of divine appointment. It is but a vain and unfounded assumption when Roman Catholics and High Anglicans maintain that Christ, by saying, ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ thereby constituted His apostles, and all to whom they should commit the same power, exclusive sacrificers. According to Holy Scriptures and the plain teaching of the Fathers, every holy act of a devout Christian may be spoken of in sacrificial language, whether in relation to the Lord’s Supper, or to any other Christian duty and privilege.

CHAPTER XIII.

AN EXAMINATION OF THOSE PASSAGES FROM THE FATHERS WHICH DR PUSEY HAS MORE ESPECIALLY CITED IN PROOF OF HIS DOCTRINE. APOSTOLIC AND OTHER FATHERS, WHOM DR PUSEY HAS NOT CITED, ADDUCED AGAINST HIM. SOME OF THE LEADING POINTS OF DR PUSEY'S RECENT SERMON CONSIDERED, AND REFERENCES MADE TO OTHER PARTS OF THIS VOLUME WHERE THEY HAVE BEEN ANSWERED. A FULL EXAMINATION OF DR PUSEY'S CANON OF PATRISTIC INTERPRETATION, BY WHICH HE WOULD MAKE IT APPEAR THAT THE SACRAMENTAL PHRASES OF THE FATHERS MUST BE SO UNDERSTOOD AS TO TEACH HIS DOCTRINE.

1. IN this chapter it is intended to examine more especially those passages from the Fathers which Dr Pusey has cited in his sermons on the doctrine of the real presence, as it is presumed that he would there give passages in his judgment the most likely to prove and maintain his doctrine. It should be borne in mind, as we have already noticed in the introduction (ch. i. 32), that in order to know what was the belief of the Fathers respecting the doctrine of the real presence, three of the ablest of them are amply sufficient for the purpose. If the doctrine as taught by Paschasius and his disciples cannot be found in these, but much that is clearly subversive of it is found in them, it may be fairly concluded that it formed no part of the faith of the early Church. The point to be ascertained is very simple. Was it a part of the faith of the early Church that the phrase, 'This is my body,' was understood as literally as the phrase, 'the Word was God;' or was it understood figuratively, as the phrase, 'It is the Lord's Passover,' 'That rock was Christ,' or 'I am the true Vine?' And did they teach that bread became, or was transubstantiated, into Christ's body? Had they taught the doctrine which Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey ascribe to them, a doctrine in itself so simple, and at the same time so profoundly important, we should expect to find the evidence so complete and so overwhelming that there need be no doubt respecting it. Dr Pusey considers that he has adduced evidence of that kind, hence, referring to his 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers,

he says, 'The following evidence that the belief in the real presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first, is more than enough to convince one who is willing to be convinced. If this convince not, neither would any other. There is no flaw, no doubt, I might almost say, no loophole, except that man always finds one, to escape what he is unwilling to accept.' (35 39.) This statement was made in the year 1855, and in his recent sermon (1871) he does not retract, but rather confirms it. He says, 'This doctrine of the real presence, all who know ever so little of the ancient Fathers and Councils know to have been taught from the first. To repeat a summary (which, doubtless, you have not seen), because I know of none simpler.' (p. 26.) He then gives a page from his book of 1855. In accordance with these considerations, he maintains that his doctrine has been believed always, everywhere, and by all. (See ch. ix. 1.) Now it must be admitted, that if the doctrine in question was known and thus universally received, the evidence of its existence would be just such as Dr Pusey maintains it is; but it really is not so. We shall not venture to characterize such wild and outrageous assumptions beyond stating that Dr Pusey must be under some unaccountable hallucination to make them. As most of the Ritualists, and many High Anglicans, accept the testimony of the Fathers through Dr Pusey without examining it for themselves; so it is to be feared that he, to a large extent, has accepted the same testimony on the authority of Roman Catholic authors. This is the most charitable view to take of the partial and unfair citations which he has given from the Fathers. We have seen how closely he has followed Dr Wiseman, even in his unfounded novelties, and we shall give an illustration presently to show how fully he has included in his list of extracts from the Fathers all, or nearly all, those passages which had been selected by Roman Catholics to prove the same doctrine as he himself defends. Were we to accept his own statements respecting the extent of his knowledge of the Fathers in regard to the doctrine of the real presence, we must come to the conclusion that it is of a very limited character. For he affirms respecting the evidence which he has given, 'I have not KNOWINGLY omitted anything. I have

'given every passage, as far as in me lay,' &c. (35 41.) Now it is a most undoubted fact, to which these volumes very abundantly testify, that passages from the Fathers of the most vital importance in the present controversy, passages, too, commonly cited by the Reformers and Protestant Divines generally, in more modern times, have been ignored, as if they had no existence. In our *Catena Patrum* all the passages which we have taken from Dr Pusey's citations from the Fathers we have given in italics and distinct brackets. Other parts of our *Catena* not so distinguished, form no portion of Dr Pusey's extracts from the Fathers, and in them will be found passages of essential importance in the present controversy, and some of them well known and repeatedly used in the refutation of the heresy of Paschasius and his disciples. If these omissions have arisen from want of knowledge, for Dr Pusey says, he has '*not knowingly omitted anything*,' then we may account in some measure for what otherwise is really unaccountable, viz., his confidence and assurance that his doctrine is that of the Fathers. But this want of knowledge, whether real or assumed, will not account for the very unfair manner in which he has made his citations from the Fathers, of which many flagrant instances are given in these volumes. The above statements of Dr Pusey are extremely perplexing. Perhaps in the judgment of charity we ought to receive them as honestly made, and if so, he has much to learn, as well as to unlearn, respecting the testimony of the Fathers in regard to the doctrine in dispute. Had he in the above statements for the most part denied what he has affirmed, and affirmed what he has denied, we could have accepted his testimony; for after a very complete examination of the patristic records, we can come to no other conclusion than that the doctrine in question was unknown for six or seven hundred years, and when made known in the ninth century by Paschasius, was ably refuted by Bertram and Rabanus Maurus.

2. The entire testimony of the Fathers is an immense field which few, even if they had the time and ability, would have the patience personally to investigate. The true nature of their testimony however, may be obtained without so extensive an exploration. We maintain that the truth may be sub-

stantially attained by the examination of the combined testimony of three leading Fathers, well reputed as biblical scholars and commentators of Holy Scripture. Such as Origen of the third century, Jerome of the fourth, and Theodoret of the fifth century. All that Dr Pusey has considered suitable to cite from these illustrious authors in support of his doctrine we have given in our *Catena*. He, as we shall show, has in his citations included those commonly quoted by Roman Catholics to prove the doctrine of the real presence as commonly held by them and by himself, so that the reader may be quite certain that all that can be quoted in defence, or rather seeming defence, of the doctrine in question has been quoted. We think that a careful examination of these passages with others, such as are given in our *Catena*, will enable the reader, by a careful examination of the whole, to come to an independent opinion as to what they really teach on the Holy Eucharist. He must avoid any attempt to make these ancient witnesses teach any preconceived opinions of his own, but simply endeavour to ascertain what they themselves teach by making them their own interpreters. If the Paschasian doctrine is not to be found in the writings of these three principal Fathers, but much that is plainly subversive of it is found, we may justly conclude that the doctrine in question was not unknown to them only, but to all the Fathers. Out of the many citations which Dr Pusey has made from these and other Fathers he doubtless would attach more importance to those which he has specially selected in his sermons as best suited in his judgment to maintain and establish his doctrine. These quotations we shall more especially examine, beginning with these three Fathers, Origen, Jerome, and Theodoret. Respecting the entire of Dr Pusey's citations from the Fathers, it should be distinctly borne in mind that nearly the whole of them, so far as they seem to serve his purpose, consist of sacramental words and phrases which he assumes must be taken literally. Thus all such nomenclature as 'mystery,' 'sacrament,' 'in mystery,' 'in sacrament,' 'mystically,' 'sacramentally,' 'body,' or 'flesh,' and 'blood,' &c., &c., in relation to the consecrated elements are assumed to be so many proofs of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in them. But

it has already been shown in different parts of this work, that he gives a private and not a catholic interpretation to these words and phrases, an interpretation which, in fact, is flatly contradicted by the plain teaching of the Fathers. Nineteen out of every twenty citations which he has made from the Fathers are of this kind, and are not deserving of notice. The reader will do well to bear this in mind while we now examine these special citations of Dr Pusey.

3. We commence with Origen. The first citation from him is, 'His flesh is true food.' (28 8.) These are almost the very words of Christ Himself. The question is, How did Origen understand them, literally, or figuratively? The words will be better understood with a little more of the context, 'Then 'obscurely was manna food; now plainly is the flesh of the 'Word of God true food, as He Himself also saith, "My flesh ' "is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed."' (11 32.) The current opinion is that Origen is one of those Fathers who did not interpret the sixth of St John sacramentally. Dean Alford in his commentary on the chapter remarks, 'I 'may roughly state, that three leading opinions may be traced; 'that of those who hold that *no reference* to the Holy Communion is intended,—among whom are Origen and Basil of 'the ancients.' No one considers that there can be any literal eating of Christ's flesh unsacramentally. With Origen then the eating in St John must be figurative and spiritual, but not literal. Both Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey rigidly maintain that our Lord is there speaking of a literal eating of His flesh in the sacrament. (34 6, 35 71.) Origen, however, according to his own plain teaching, held no such repulsive sentiments. He did not even consider that the Jews who strove among themselves respecting our Lord's teaching, understood Him in that gross and carnal sense; for he says, 'We show that they 'were not so foolish as to suppose that when saying these 'things He invited the hearers to come and to eat His flesh.' (11 3.) Again he says, 'Acknowledge that they are figures, 'the things which are written in the inspired book, and therefore, as spiritual and not as carnal persons, examine and 'understand what is said. For, if as carnal persons you 'understand them, they injure and do not nourish you. For

‘there is also in the gospel a letter which kills. A killing letter is not found in the Old Testament alone. There is also in the New Testament a letter which kills him who does not understand spiritually the things which are spoken. For if, according to the letter, thou followest the very thing which is said, “Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,” this letter kills.’ (11 29.) A yet fuller specimen of Origen’s teaching on the sixth of St John will be found in chapter vii. 55-57.

4. If the transcendental faith of the disciples of Paschasius in regard to the doctrine of the real presence was not superior to evidence and independent of common sense, it would be worse than useless to pretend to claim Origen on their side. Dr Pusey re-quotes the same passage from Origen in his sermon recently published. (28 69.) The next passage which Dr Pusey cites from Origen is as follows, ‘He who hath been initiated in the mysteries knoweth the flesh and blood of the Word of God.’ (28 9.) Here the question recurs, what does Origen mean by these words? It will be found by viewing the passage in connection with the context as given 11 30, that he is not referring to a sacramental participation, but to a participation independent of the sacrament. Thus he says, ‘Stop not at the blood of the flesh, but learn rather the blood of the Word.’ (11 30.) He plainly teaches that the blood of Christ may be drunk when we receive His words, and that His words are to be regarded as much as His sacraments. (See Ch. xi. 19, 20.) In the passage in question, Origen is manifestly borrowing the words of the sixth of St John, which we have seen, he neither interprets literally nor sacramentally. The knowing then of the flesh and blood of the Word of God rather refers to a participation through the words of Christ. How Origen teaches on this point may be seen 11 21, 28, 34-37, 41.

5. The next two passages which Dr Pusey cites from Origen, are, ‘When ye receive the body of the Lord, ye guard it with all caution and veneration, lest ever so little of it fall, lest aught of the consecrated gifts drop off.’ (28 10.) ‘How think you? is it less guilty to neglect the Word of God than to neglect His body?’ (28 11.) These words, although cited by Dr Pusey

as two passages, one on one page, and another on the other, really form one passage, as may be seen **11 22**. The Fathers did not regard the body of Christ and the Word as being identical, but the former as inferior to the latter. Origen, as we have just seen, remarks, 'Stop not at the blood of the flesh, 'but learn rather the blood of the Word.' (**11 30**.) Origen employs the phrase, 'The Word,' interchangeably as a title of the Scriptures, and of the person of our Lord. How he and other Fathers taught and commonly spoke on that point may be seen Chap. xi. 9-14. Origen and other Fathers, as we have shown in that same chapter, sections 29, 30, require more reverence and regard for the Holy Scriptures than for the consecrated elements. If a greater reverence is required by the Fathers for the Holy Scriptures than for the consecrated elements, the natural inference is, that the Fathers considered Christ was as much present in His words as in His sacraments, and this they plainly teach, as these pages abundantly testify.

6. The last citation from Origen is as follows, 'He gives to 'thee the bread of blessing, His own body, and bestows His 'own blood. (**28 12**.) Dr Pusey in these citations from Origen, assumes that he understood figurative and sacramental words and phrases literally, which is a violation of his own rule of interpretation as may be seen **11 43, 44**. The reader will see the citation with its context **11 47**, and must conclude from it that Origen is speaking of a pure spiritual participation, such as entirely excludes the Paschasian notion of participation. See especially chapter xi. 110. Out of the voluminous writings of Origen, these extracts in the judgment of Dr Pusey are the best he could cite in proof of his doctrine. Verily Origen is against the Paschasian doctrine, and not for it. It should be noticed that Dr Pusey has not adduced these passages from Origen in defence of the doctrine of the real presence for the first time, for all of them had been cited by a modern Roman Catholic work, entitled, 'The Faith of ' Catholics,'

7. We now turn to Dr Pusey's citations from Jerome. The first is as follows—'We know that wine is consecrated into 'the blood of Christ.' (**28 31**.) These words with their context are given. (**18 61**.) Here, Jerome in accordance with the universal practice of the Fathers, is employing sacramental

language which cannot be understood literally. But Jerome shall be his own interpreter. Now the faith of Paschasius (33 16, 19) and that of his disciple Dr Pusey is, that wine is consecrated into Christ's blood, which was shed by the soldier's spear. This certainly was not the faith of Jerome, for he expressly says, 'In two ways are the blood and flesh of Christ understood, either that spiritual and Divine, whereof He Himself said, "my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is " drink indeed," and, " Except ye eat my flesh and drink my " blood, ye shall not have eternal life ;" or the flesh and blood, the flesh which was crucified, the blood which was shed by the soldier's spear.' (18 62.) That Jerome in the passage under consideration did not mean the literal and natural blood of Christ is certain. In the very same chapter of his exposition where occurs the phrase in question, he also says, 'The apostle teaches that the spiritual bread of the Church, which came down from heaven, ought not to be injured by Jewish interpretation.' (18 60.) That it is not the literal blood which the communicant receives in the Lord's Supper, but the spiritual and divine, is plain from the fact that Jerome teaches that the same blood can be received 'in the reading of the Scripture. For the true food and drink which is derived from the Word of God is knowledge of the Scriptures.' (18 49.) 'The gospel is the body of Jesus, that the Holy Scriptures are His doctrine. And since He says, "He who doth not eat my flesh and drink my blood," although it can be understood in the Eucharist ; yet more truly is the word of the Scriptures the body of Christ, and the divine doctrine is His blood.' (18 50.) 'The flesh of Christ and His blood are poured into our ears' (18 51); and 'the flesh of Christ, which is the Word of doctrine, that is, the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.' (18 52.) Elsewhere Jerome says, 'Melchizedek consecrated the Christian mystery (that is, bread and wine) in the body and blood of the Saviour.' (18 3.) No one has any right to give a private interpretation to any sacramental phrase of Jerome ; he must be allowed to be his own interpreter, and if so, we may be certain that it is of spiritual and divine blood that he speaks, and not of literal or real blood. No

one pretends that Melchizedek consecrated wine into the real blood of Christ, no one ought to pretend from the use of the same language that wine is now consecrated into the real blood of Christ.

8. A second citation from Jerome is, 'The Lord Jesus 'gives us the true bread ; He eateth with us, and Himself is 'eaten ; we drink His blood, and without Him we cannot 'drink it.' (28 32.) This when considered in the light of the context as given 18 19, 21, cannot be considered as having reference to a literal and real eating of Christ's body and drinking of His blood, but as showing our mystical union with Christ and incorporation in Him, so that what He does in the Eucharist we do, and what we do He also does. Such is the closeness of the union between the body of true believers and Christ their Head. How Jerome teaches on this point we have noticed in chapter xi. 83, and how the Fathers generally teach on that point, may be seen in the same chapter, sections 80-103. That Jerome most certainly is speaking of a spiritual participation and not of really eating the flesh of Christ, and Christ really eating His own flesh with us, is plain from the fact that the participation is with Christ above (*sursum*), 'and keeping there with Him the passover.' (18 20.) According to Dr Pusey, Jerome must be of the school of Calvin. (See chapter xi., 110.) The *sursum corda*, as understood and explained by the early Fathers, has special relation to this participation and communion with Christ above, to which Jerome most certainly alludes. (See ch. xii., 120-124.) Of this spiritual union and mystical communion, and participation, Jerome speaks after the same manner elsewhere. (18 39.)

9. The third and fourth quotations from Jerome are, 'We 'pollute bread, that is, the body of Christ.' 'Handle the 'body of the Lord.' (28 33, 34.) Here in both these instances Jerome is using the common sacramental phrases which neither Dr Pusey nor any other disciple of Paschasius has proved, must be understood literally. Respecting the former citation, its context throws considerable light upon it, as may be seen 18 47, 48, where Jerome speaks of a teacher of the Church making spiritual bread and polluting it, that is,

the bread of doctrine. Out of the nine folio volumes of Jerome's writings, Dr Pusey can adduce no better evidence than the above, and it is, in fact, against his doctrine, and not in favour of it. As in the case of Origen, so here he has simply requoted the passages as given in the 'Faith of Catholics,' meaning the faith of Roman and modern Roman Catholics, which, as thus defined, is really uncatholic. Before leaving Jerome, it is necessary to remark that many of the citations made from him by Dr Pusey are really not worth quoting. Such as those where Jerome, having occasion to name the consecrated elements, gave them their Scriptural title, that is, body and blood. Of this kind are those which will be found under the following references, **18 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 17, 18, 37.** So far were Jerome and Augustine from ever designating the consecrated elements by the names descriptive of what they really were, as St Paul did, when citing his words they substitute for bread and cup the words body and blood. Why they did so we have explained in chapter ix. **25, 26.**

10. We now come to notice the solitary citation from Theodoret, which is as follows, 'He nourisheth and cherisheth the Church, and giveth her His own body and blood.' (**28 62.**) But this passage rather refers to Baptism than to the Eucharist, as may be seen when viewed in the light of the context as given **23 31.** According to the teaching of Theodoret, Christ is no more our food literally in the Eucharist than He is our well in Baptism. Speaking of the mysteries or sacraments of both rites he remarks that Christ is 'at once the food and the well of His own sheep.' (**23 11.**) According to the plain teaching of the Fathers the participation of Christ in Baptism was essentially the same as in the Eucharist. (see ch. xi. **106, 107.**) That those who rightly receive Baptism are then made partakers of Christ's body and blood was the common opinion of the Fathers. (see ch. xii. **80, 115.**) Chrysostom and the Fathers generally regarded the text on which Theodoret founded his remarks as relating to Baptism rather than the Eucharist, and so taught Chrysostom. (**22 30.**)

11. Out of 7250 goodly octavo pages of the writings of Theodoret, Dr Pusey has favoured us with only one passage

in his sermons in proof of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, and it proves no such thing, but rather refers to a spiritual participation of Christ's body and blood in Baptism, by which the believer is visibly incorporated into Christ, so as in a mystical but real union, to be bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh. Dr Pusey must have had a very limited knowledge of the real teaching of Origen, Jerome, and Theodoret, or he must have presumed very much upon the limited knowledge of those for whose instruction he wrote, or he never could have appealed to these three witnesses, in connection with others, with such apparent confidence and assurance as witnesses to his doctrine, for, in fact, they refute it by anticipation. This citation from Theodoret by Dr Pusey had also been made in the so called 'Faith of Catholics.'

12. As it is only in the cases of Origen, Jerome, and Theodoret that we have included in our *Catena Patrum* all that Dr Pusey has cited from them, and as we consider their testimony quite sufficient to settle the controversy in question, we beg the reader most carefully to examine the whole of what is given in our *Catena*. What Dr Pusey has cited is included in italics and distinct brackets, and what he has omitted to cite is not so included. Almost every section has been noticed and where noticed may be seen from the references in the *Catena* to the first volume. In his citation he has added nothing of importance towards proving his doctrine beyond what has already been cited for the same purpose in the so called 'Faith of Catholics.' The passages which had been cited from Origen, Jerome, and Theodoret are **11** 10, 19, 22, 30, 32, 34, 38, 39, 47, 50; **18** 1, 2, 3, 8, 11, 15, 17, 20, 21, 34, 36, 47, 56, 61, 64; **23** 1, 2, 4, 14, 27, 28, 29, 31, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 50. He has cited several important passages from Origen, but had he cited more of the context with them, they would have been seen to have been directly against his doctrine, and not even seeming to be in its favour. Such passages are, **11** 5, 12-18, 24-29, 31, 34-36, 38, 47, 48.

13. We now proceed to notice the quotations which Dr Pusey has made from the Apostolical Fathers. Of the six he

has only made selections from Ignatius. From Clement, by far the most valuable of the apostolical witnesses, we have no citation whatever. There does not appear to be any allusion to the Eucharist in his writings, which is utterly unaccountable, if, as Dr Pusey pretends, the doctrine of the real presence was believed and esteemed of such infinite importance. Hermas, Polycarp, Barnabas, and the author of the epistle to Diognetus are equally silent, which silence of itself utterly ignores the Paschasian notion of the real presence. This doctrine, if true, is one of infinite moment, and the fact that five out of six apostolical witnesses do not so much as allude to the Eucharist, when, as we shall show presently, nothing could have been more natural for them than to have done it, is one of the most powerful arguments that can be adduced against the doctrine in question.

14. Roman Catholics cite a passage from Clement in proof of the sacrifice of the mass, as appears in a book miscalled 'The Faith of Catholics.' Some High Anglicans cite Clement to prove that Christian ministers have an exclusive right to present material offerings in the Lord's Supper. The passage thus adduced is 1 4, 5. But most assuredly the only offerings alluded to are the Jewish, and the only offerers are the Jewish priests. He distinctly mentions high priests and priests and the offerings peculiar to them in connection with the Jewish altar and Jewish temple (1 5.) Romanists and High Anglicans assume that in some way or other the Christian ministry is included by Clement in the Jewish priesthood, and as the latter had sacrifices to offer, so also have the former. Clement gives no ground whatever for this conclusion, and really restricts the sacrificing of which he speaks to the Jewish priesthood, for he states, 'That which is offered being first carefully examined by the high priest, and the ministers already mentioned. They, therefore, who do anything beyond that which is agreeable to His will are punished with death.' (1 5.)

15. Had Clement believed the Paschasian doctrine, considering its importance if true, we should have expected to find some allusion thereto in such passages as those given. 1 1, 2, 3. In such passages as these, or in similar ones in his famous epistle, we surely should have found some Eucha-

ristic allusion if any such belief of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements as that held by Paschasius and his disciple Dr Pusey, had existed in his mind.

16. Hermas too, when speaking of 'the great mysteries in 'the building of the militant and triumphant Church,' had a fine opportunity of expatiating with his powerful imagination upon the inexplicable mysteries, marvels, and wonders of the Lord's Supper had his mind been pervaded with the extravagant sacramental notions now so common with Romanists and Romanizers; but, like Clement, he makes no mention of them, and does not even allude to the Lord's Supper. (2.)

17. Polycarp makes mention very distinctly of the fundamental doctrine of our Holy Christianity, namely, the death of Christ for us, and our living in Him as the result thereof. (4 1.) But according to the teaching of Dr Pusey and his school, there can be no living in Christ without a real participation of His body and blood in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, and, notwithstanding, Polycarp, in his epistle to the Philippians, dwelling upon matters of supreme importance, he, like his brethren Clement and Hermas, makes not even a passing allusion to the doctrine in question, nor even refers to the Lord's Supper.

18. If the doctrine of Dr Pusey and his friends really formed a part of the Christian faith from the first, and was not for the most part concocted by Paschasius in the ninth century, Barnabas, from the circumstance of his dwelling upon topics so nearly connected with the Lord's Supper, could not have ignored the doctrine in question. Dwelling very fully upon Christian sacrifice, he does not give the remotest hint of any sacrificing in the Lord's Supper. (5 1, 2.) Speaking upon the new Covenant founded on the sufferings of Christ, and how 'He delivered up His flesh to corruption, that we might be 'sanctified by the remission of sins, which is effected by the 'blood of sprinkling.' (5 3.) He does not utter a syllable about any literal drinking of the blood in the sacrament. All the disciples of Paschasius make it appear that there can be no salvation without a real eating of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements. How completely unknown these sentiments were to Barnabas is obvious from the fact that he

declares, 'As far as possible, and could be done with perspicuity, 'I cherish the hope that, according to my desire, I have omitted 'none of those things at present which bear upon your salvation.' (5 6.) Some of the more important things which did bear upon the Christian's salvation Barnabas has noticed, (5 3-5), but the doctrine in question is not one of them. Doubtless it was completely unknown to him.

19. The evangelical and very enlightened author of the Epistle to Diognetus, wishing to instruct that person as he desired, and imploring God to enable him to do so to his edification (6 1), yet records no such sentiments as those on the Eucharist which are now so commonly held by Romanists, nor does he even refer to the Eucharist. He has recorded much for the instruction and edification of Diognetus which far surpasses everything recorded by the other apostolical witnesses whom we have noticed, yet, like these he is equally reticent on the doctrine in question. How beautifully he speaks of what Christ has done for us, and in us, and of the ineffable relationship which subsists between Christ and us may be seen 6 2, 3. Had the doctrine in question had any place in the belief of this author, it is perfectly incredible that he could have spoken after that manner without so much as alluding to it.

20. We come now to Ignatius, the only apostolical Father to whom Dr Pusey has appealed in proof of his doctrine. It should be borne in mind, that it is of little consequence in regard to the present controversy, whether Ignatius wrote all that goes under his name, or not; what is generally ascribed to him is sufficiently ancient and accredited to warrant an appeal thereto on the subject of the present controversy. We accept then, as legitimate evidence, the epistles commonly ascribed to Ignatius, whether in their shorter or longer recensions. The first passage cited by Dr Pusey in his sermon is, 'Misbelievers 'who confess not that the Eucharist is flesh of our Saviour Jesus 'Christ, the flesh which suffered for our sins, which the Father 'in His mercy raised again.' (28 1.) A fuller account is given 3 6. In the longer recension, the same sentiment is expressed thus, 'They are ashamed of the cross; they mock 'at the passion; they make a jest of the resurrection,' &c.

Theodoret has cited the passage as evidence against the Eutychian heresy somewhat differently, in the place of 'prayer,' there is the 'offering,' 'They abstain from the Eucharist and the offering, because they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of Christ.' (Tom. iv., p. 231.) Ignatius is, without doubt, referring to those early heretics who denied that Jesus had come in the flesh, and who were represented by such heretics as Valentinus and Marcion. Had Ignatius believed that the Eucharist was really the flesh of Christ, as Dr Pusey and all the disciples of Paschasius do, such teaching on the Eucharist would have tended to confirm these heretics in their heresy, and not have converted them from it. The nature and force of the argument to be employed by them, we have noticed elsewhere. (Ch. ix. 49, 50.) We have already seen how Theodoret argued against this school of heretics, not by holding that the Eucharist was really Christ's flesh, for he so reasons as to show that, in his opinion, it was no more Christ's real flesh, than Christ Himself was a real vine. (See Ch. xii. 48.) The circumstance, then, of his citing the above passage of Ignatius as evidence against the heresy he was combating, proves that he could not have conceived of Ignatius in that passage, holding such an outrageous opinion as that which Dr Pusey ascribes to him. The second passage which Dr Pusey quotes in his sermon (28 2) has no necessary reference to sacramental eating, and so perhaps Dr Pusey subsequently considered, for, on maturer thought, although he gave it a place in his sermon, he has rejected it in his elaborate work of more than 700 pages in defence of his sermon, and where he quotes more than 400 pages from the Fathers. Whatever may be the worth or the worthlessness of the epistles attributed to Ignatius, they are not for Dr Pusey's doctrine, but indirectly against it.

21. Justin Martyr is the next witness from whom Dr Pusey gives a single citation in which Justin, after the example of our Lord, calls the consecrated bread the body of Jesus. (28 3.) Such a citation is not worthy of notice. In his recent sermon, he has quoted the same passage with more of the context, but (28 63,) as he has not done so fairly, we here give the citation, supplying in italics the passage left out, 'We

‘receive not the Eucharist as common bread or as common drink, but in what way Jesus Christ our Saviour being, through the Word of God, incarnate, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also have we been taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made by the prayer of the word which is from Him, *by which food, undergoing the necessary change, our flesh and blood are nourished, we are taught, I say, that this food is the flesh and blood of Him, the incarnate Jesus.*’ (7 2.) This passage, when fairly given, teaches a species of transubstantiation, not, however, of the bread into the real body of Christ, but of the consecrated bread and wine into the flesh and blood of the communicants who receive it. From the circumstance that Justin here considers that the bread and wine which he entitles body and blood are assimilated to the flesh and blood of the communicants, we may conclude with certainty that he did not consider that the consecrated elements which he scripturally calls body or flesh and blood were Christ’s real flesh and blood, for surely he never would degrade them into carnal food. Dr Pusey and most of the Romanists profess to believe that Christ’s body and blood are not carnal, but spiritual food, and whether or not, we are sure that they are so, for our Lord Himself says so.

22. Irenæus.—From this witness, Dr Pusey in his sermon of 1853 gives the following extract only. ‘The Eucharist becomes Christ’s body and blood.’ (28 4.) But, on maturer consideration, he seems to have rejected it since it forms no part of the elaborate notes to his sermon. The passage of which the above words form a part, is a kindred one to that just noticed from Justin, in which Irenæus makes carnal food of what he calls the body of Christ, doubtless meaning the consecrated bread which bore that title. The whole passage is as follows, ‘When, therefore, the mingled cup and the manufactured bread receives the word of God, and the Eucharist of the blood and the body of Christ is made, [or following the Greek, the Eucharist becomes the body of Christ,] from which things the substance of our flesh is increased and supported,’ &c. (Lib. v. 2, 3.)

23. Dr Pusey in his sermon just published (1871) has cited two passages from Irenæus, which we must also examine. The

first citation is, 'The divine communion was the body and 'blood of Christ.' (28 64.) These words form part of a passage quoted by Œcumenius from Irenæus to enforce the practice of abstinence. Œcumenius is commenting upon the words, 'abstain from fleshly lusts,' &c. (1 Peter ii. 11, 12), and he gives the following as an instructive incentive to abstinence, from Irenæus :—

'For, when the Greeks, having arrested the slaves of Christian 'catechumens, then used force against them, in order to learn from 'them some secret thing [practised] among Christians, these slaves 'having nothing to say that would meet the wishes of their tormentors, 'except, that they had heard from their masters that the divine participation (*μετέλαγχον*) was the body and blood of Christ, and imagined 'that it was actual flesh and blood, gave their inquisitors answer to 'that effect. Then these latter, assuming such to be the case with 'regard to the practice of Christians, gave information regarding it to 'the Greeks, and sought to compel the martyrs Sanctus and Blandina 'to confess under the influence of torture, [that the allegation was correct]. To these men, Blandina replied very admirably in these 'words: "How should those persons endure such [accusations], who, '“for the sake of the practice [of piety], did not avail themselves of '“the flesh (*κρέας*) that was permitted [them to eat]?"' (Cap. iii., vol. II., p. 498.)

A more unfortunate passage Dr Pusey could not well have cited. For it is most plainly implied that the divine participation was not really or actually of Christ's body and blood, which is a flat contradiction of what both Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey maintain. (34 6 ; 35 71.) The point of the incident is this : these devoted Christians did not eat what was unlawful for them to eat, namely, the flesh and blood of Christ, but they did not even eat ordinary flesh which was permitted them to eat.

24. Dr Pusey's second citation from Irenæus in his recent sermon is, 'Taking bread of this our creation, He confessed 'that the mingled drink of the cup was His own blood.' (28 65.) These words form part of an argument against the heresy of Marcion and Valentinus, whom he mentions by name. He asks, 'How could the Lord with any justice, if he 'belonged to another father, have acknowledged the bread to 'be His body, while He took it from that creation to which 'we belong, and affirmed the mixed cup to be His blood ? And

‘why did He acknowledge Himself to be the Son of Man, if He had not gone through that birth which belongs to a human being?’ (Lib. iv. 33 2.) Here Irenæus, in common with most of the early Fathers, some of whom we have already noticed, is showing that the consecrated elements were symbols or figures of a real body and of real blood, not that they were really Christ’s body and blood, for this, as we have elsewhere noticed, (Ch. ix. 49, 50,) would have favoured the Marcionite heresy, and not have refuted it.

25. Clement of Alexandria is the next witness whom we have to examine. From him Dr Pusey has made in his earlier sermon two citations, which form a portion of one and the same paragraph. The citations are, ‘The Lord provided for us food from Himself. He offereth flesh, and poureth out blood, and nothing is wanting to the children’s growth.’ (28 5.) We receive Him, ‘and lay Him up in ourselves, and place the Saviour in our breasts [S. Clement adds], “as far as possible,” because we receive Him who, as God, is infinite.’ (28 6.) These extracts, with their context, are given 9 3, and if this portion of the writings of Clement is compared with the other part of the chapter, of which it also forms a part, as given 9 1-5, it will be seen that he has no reference whatever to a sacramental participation of Christ, but to a spiritual, though real participation of Him without any reference to sacramental or visible signs. But if this vital and real participation of Christ’s body and blood can be realised without the sacrament of the Eucharist, then these citations from Clement do not favour Dr Pusey’s doctrine, but go very much against it, inasmuch as, according to Clement, ‘we can receive the Saviour, and lay Him up in ourselves, and place Him in our breasts as far as possible’ (9 3), without the sacrament or mystery of the Lord’s Supper. Dr Pusey could have had but a very limited knowledge of the chapter from which he quoted his extracts, or he must have presumed very much upon his readers’ want of knowledge. In the whole chapter there is no allusion to the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, but the plainest and most undoubted proofs of Christ’s being really received, as far as possible, independently of Eucharistic participation. This spiritual, though

real participation of Christ is represented under the figure of receiving milk. Now no one can pretend that this is any sign or symbol of the Lord's Supper. Speaking of Christ, the Word, Clement remarks, 'The Word is fluid, and mild as milk, or solid and compact as meat,' and entertaining this view, 'we may regard the proclamation of the gospel, which is universally diffused, as milk and as meat; faith, which from instruction is compacted into a foundation, which being more substantial than hearing, is likened to meat, and assimilates to the soul itself nourishment of this kind. Elsewhere the Lord, in the Gospel according to John, brought this out by symbols, when He said, "Eat ye my flesh, and drink my blood." (9 1, 2.) Nothing can be plainer than that here Clement understood the sixth of St John not literally but spiritually and figuratively in regard to the flesh and blood of Christ, and not necessarily sacramentally, for he distinctly teaches that the blood of Christ can be, and in fact is, in the first instance received as milk, and that milk is of the same substance as meat and blood. Of meat he says, 'Regarding the meat not as something different from the milk, but the same in substance,' (9 1.) Of the blood he remarks, 'Blood passes into milk by a change which does not affect its substance.' (9 4.) Clement, with the Fathers generally, considers a real but spiritual participation to be represented in the sixth of St John, especially in the words, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.' Clement was anxious to show that although he dwelt upon Christ's being received under the figure of milk, yet milk being of the same substance as meat and blood, he in nowise departed from Christ's teaching. Moreover he says, 'In many ways the Word is figuratively represented as meat, and flesh, and food, and bread, and blood, and milk. The Lord is all these to give enjoyment to us who have believed on Him. Let no one then think it strange when we say that the Lord's blood is figuratively represented as milk. For is it not figuratively represented as wine?' (9 5.) The reader must carefully examine the evidence given, 9 1-5, and we think he cannot fail to see that although Clement is dwelling especially upon the ineffable union which is effected, and

which subsists between Christ and true believers, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not so much as alluded to. We have little or no allusion to the Eucharist in the writings of Clement. One of the few instances is the following (9 6 at the beginning.) Here, like Jerome, (18 62), he speaks of the blood of the Lord as twofold, but the natural blood, that shed by the soldier's spear, according to Clement, was not really received in the Eucharist.

26. The following is cited by Dr Pusey in his recent sermon, 'Being both bread and flesh, He giveth Himself, being both 'to us to eat.' (28 66.) This is an extract from the fragments of the writings of Clement, to which we have not access. It appears either to be a citation from those parts of Clement's writings, which are given, 9 4, 5, or to contain the same sentiments. The reader will there see how he shows that 'the Word is figuratively represented as meat, and flesh, and food, 'and bread, and blood, and milk.' (9 5.)

27. Tertullian is the next witness that comes in order. From him Dr Pusey has cited in his former sermon the following, 'Approach those hands to the body of the Lord.' 'The body of the Lord is offended.' (28 7.) Here Tertullian, like the Fathers generally, calls the sign by the name of that of which it is a sign or figure. He himself explains our Lord's words, 'This is my body,' thus, 'That is, a figure of my body.' (10 12.) Dr Pusey in his recent sermon has cited two more passages from Tertullian. One is, 'He hath consecrated His blood in wine, who then figured forth wine in blood.' (28 67.) This has only to be read in connection with its context, as given 10 11-14, more especially with section 14, and it will be seen that the passage cited is not in favour of Dr Pusey's doctrine, but against it. In the mind of Tertullian, Christ, in the blessing of Judah, figured wine in blood in the same sense as He consecrated His blood in wine. He plainly says that the blessing of Judah 'showed the garments and clothes to be 'Christ's flesh, and the wine to be His blood.' (10 14.) Dr Pusey, for some reason or other, most unfairly omitted this clause without giving any intimation thereof, as may be seen at the close of the passage to which the above reference is made. Tertullian is here arguing against Marcion, and is proving from figures of speech used in Scripture that Christ

had flesh and blood, which Marcion denied. Tertullian does not of course adduce these figures of speech or metaphors to prove that they were actually and really that of which they were figures or metaphors. This, as we have shown elsewhere, would have favoured the heresy of Marcion, not have refuted it. The other passage which Dr Pusey quotes is, 'The flesh 'feeds on the body and blood of Christ.' (28 68.) This has only to be exhibited in connection with its context to show how utterly worthless the citation is for the purpose for which it has been adduced.

'Now, such remarks have I wished to advance in defence of the 'flesh, from a general view of the condition of our human nature. 'Let us now consider its special relation to Christianity, and see how 'vast a privilege before God has been conferred on this poor and 'worthless substance. It would suffice to say, indeed, that there is 'not a soul that can at all procure salvation, except it believe whilst 'it is in the flesh, so true is it that the flesh is the very condition on 'which salvation hinges. And since the soul is, in consequence of its 'salvation, chosen to the service of God, it is the flesh which actually 'renders it capable of such service. The flesh, indeed, is washed, in 'order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed that the 'soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed [with the cross], that the 'soul too may be fortified; the flesh is shadowed with the imposition 'of hands, that the soul also may be illuminated by the Spirit; the 'flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul like- 'wise may fatten on God.' (*De Resurrectione Carnis*, cap. viii., pp. 317, 318.)

28. Here beyond all question Tertullian calls the material, visible substances not by the terms descriptive of what they actually and really were, namely, bread and wine, but by the titles of body and blood, not that they were really so, for how could he conceive that Christ's body and blood in the sacrament were carnal food with which to feed the flesh? Paschasius himself denied this, and so do most of his disciples, even those of the Roman school. From Tertullian we learn that the sacramental substances bread and wine, although he calls them body and blood, no more were, or contained that which they represented or signified, than did the sacramental substance of water and oil. Still a right reception of these sacramental substances and outward rites would aid the faith of the recipient as he teaches, and would thereby consecrate, fortify, illuminate, and fatten the soul.

29. From Cyprian Dr Pusey has made the following citations, 'He is the Bread of us who appertain to His body.' (28 13.) 'The hand receives the Lord's body.' (28 14, 70.) 'They invade the body of the Lord. Offer violence to the body. To profane the sacred body of the Lord.' (28 15.) 'Receive the Lord's body in defiled hands, and drink the Lord's blood with polluted mouths.' (28 16.) 'We drink His Blood to the propitiation for our sins, and participation of the immortality in Him.' (28 17.) All these citations are nearly of the same kind, with the exception of the first. They simply show that Cyprian, in accordance with the general practice of Scripture, and the universal practice of the early Church, calls sacraments or sacred signs by the names of those things which they represent or signify, and which Augustine has so fully explained, as we have shown in chapter x. 27-29. In our citations from Cyprian the reader will find enough to make him his own commentator. Cyprian teaches most plainly that the consecrated elements are no more really whole Christ, body, soul, and Divinity, than they are the entire Church, bodies, souls, and spirits. Three hundred instances where he calls the consecrated elements by the names of that which they represent or signify, prove no more than three would. The question is, what did he mean by calling the bread the body of Christ, or the body of Christ the bread? That he did not mean what Dr Pusey ascribes to him, his own statements testify. It is not necessary for us to repeat here what we have said in other parts of these volumes. The reader by consulting our citations from Cyprian, and following the references from them to the parts where they are explained in the first volume, will be in a position to form a fair estimate of the sacramental teaching of Cyprian. In relation to the Eucharist, the most important part of Cyprian's writings is his epistle 63, from which Dr Pusey in his larger work has made several citations, but only those which show the relation of the consecrated elements to Christ's body and blood, and he has not cited those passages which show the relation of the same consecrated elements to Christ's body of believing people. An ample specimen of his unfair citations may be seen, 12 2-8.

30. In regard to the first citation (28 13) which we have given a little above, it relates to our mystical union with Christ who is always the 'Bread of those who appertain to 'His body,' whether in the sacrament of the Eucharist or apart from it. Cyprian is interpreting the phrase, 'daily bread' of the Lord's prayer, which, as generally interpreted by the Fathers, has no necessary reference to sacramental participation, the Bread being there understood as not referring to sacramental bread, but to the Bread, even Christ Himself, of which the sacramental bread was a sacrament or sign. How the Fathers, and Cyprian among them, teach on this point, may be seen, chapter xi. 55-67.

31. Lactantius comes the next in order, but Dr Pusey has entirely omitted him as a witness. The silence of this eloquent author in regard to the Lord's Supper, is as impressive and ominous as that of the apostolical Fathers noticed above. (Secs. 13-19.) Out of an octavo volume of about 1000 pages, which contain the writings of Lactantius, we cannot find a sentence which has any direct relation to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. His writings abound with lofty and devout religious sentiments, and in many parts of his writings it would have been both natural and suitable to introduce the Holy Communion, the omission of which is most inexplicable, if he held that part of the Christian faith in regard to the Eucharist, which Dr Pusey so confidently ascribes to the early Church. We have only given two extracts in our *Catena* from his writings. (13 1, 2.) He eloquently condemns the idolatry of the heathens, and by anticipation, the practices of many who, in more modern times, professed and called themselves Christians. Extracts are given from his writings on this point in chapter xii. 164.

32. Ruffinus is another witness to whom Dr Pusey has not given a place in his list. In 20 1-10 is given all that we could find, directly or indirectly, referring to the Lord's Supper, and our edition of his writings forms two folio volumes. The most important part of his writings is his exposition of the creed which is the most valuable one we possess of the early Church. In this he appears to allude to the Eucharist, when speaking of the pierced side of Christ, as follows, 'It produced, there-

‘fore, water which washes believers ; It produced also blood, which will condemn unbelievers. It, however, may be understood to figure the twofold grace of baptism ; one which was given by the water of baptism, the other which is sought by the mystery of the shedding of blood, for both are named ‘baptism.’ (20 6.) Whatever may be the worth or the worthlessness of this statement in itself, it is evidence, though of a negative character, from the most learned author of his age, with the exception of Jerome, and it is most unfavourable to the school of Paschasius on the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. (See chapter ix. 106.)

33. Dr Pusey in his sermons has made the following citations from Eusebius. ‘He gave them for food the heavenly bread, Himself gave Himself.’ (28 18, 71.) ‘Having the senses purified, so as to be able to eat the living Bread and His life-giving Flesh, and to drink His saving blood.’ (28 19.) ‘Eat the living Bread and the life-giving Flesh, and drink his saving blood.’ (28 20.) ‘Receive His body and blood. That saving body, Christ Himself.’ (28 21.) ‘On every Lord’s day we are quickened by the hallowed body of the same Saviour’s passover, and are sealed in our souls by His precious blood.’ (28 22.)

34. We know how Dr Pusey would have his readers to understand these phrases and the purpose for which he has cited them. He assumes without proof, or any attempt at proof, that the above quotations necessarily relate to sacramental participation of Christ’s flesh and blood, and that they must be understood literally and not figuratively. Now, if we allow Eusebius to interpret his own phrases, as we are bound to do, we shall find that Dr Pusey is indulging in groundless assumptions. The above phrases are, for the most part, made up of words borrowed from our Lord’s teaching in the sixth of St John. But Eusebius so explains that part of our Lord’s teaching as not necessarily referring to a sacramental participation, and the words and phrases thereof relating to a participation of Himself not as literal, but as spiritual and figurative. He plainly says, ‘Christ’s words and discourses are the flesh and blood of which he who always partakes as one fed upon heavenly food shall be a partaker of heavenly life.’ For this and more upon the

same point, see **14 5, 6**. He speaks also very distinctly of the consecrated elements being 'the symbols of Christ's body and saving blood,' (**14 2**), of 'the symbols of the divine dispensation;' of 'the symbol of His own body,' (**14 4**.) He also speaks of celebrating the memory of Christ's sacrifice by the consecrated elements which he calls symbols, (**14 2**), and by them also making the image of Christ's body. (**14 4**.) Such language is utterly incompatible with the idea that the consecrated elements are not only symbols, but are also the things of which they are the symbols, and by them is made not only the image of Christ's body, but His very body itself.

35. Cyril of Jerusalem comes next to be considered. Dr Pusey, in his former sermon, cites the following, 'We become 'Christ-bearers, His body and blood being diffused through our 'members.' (**28 23**.) This passage doubtless relates to our mystical union with Christ as may be seen from the context. (**15 12**.) But according to the general teaching of the Fathers, believers are said to be partakers of Christ's body and blood in Baptism (Ch. vii. **44-46**) and to be incorporated into Him. Cyril himself plainly teaches that before coming to the Lord's Supper, believers are made partakers and fellows of Christ, and are properly called Christs (anointed ones). (**15 10**.) According to the teaching of Cyril, Christ is as really received in Baptism of which Chrism in his time was a part, as he is in the Eucharist. No one pretends that the man Christ Jesus was really and actually present in the one case, and no one ought to pretend that He is so in the other. Dr Pusey also gives in his recent sermon another passage from Cyril, which is, 'The bread of the 'Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is mere bread 'no longer, but the body of Christ.' (**28 72**.) This passage, viewed in the light of the context, as given **15 11**, is against the opinion that the bread, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, in consequence of ceasing to be 'mere' or 'plain' bread (**15 12**), had become the real body of Christ. Cyril affirms no more of the bread after the invocation of the Holy Ghost than of the ointment after the invocation of the Holy Ghost; in fact, he employs the change in the former to illustrate the change in the latter. Thus he says, 'Beware of supposing 'that to be plain ointment. For as the bread of the Eucharist

‘after the invocation of the Holy Ghost is mere bread no longer, but the body of Christ; so also this holy ointment is no more simple ointment nor (so to say) common after the invocation, but the gift of Christ, and by the presence of His godhead, it causes in us the Holy Ghost.’ (15 11.) Does Cyril here teach that the ointment after the invocation of the Holy Ghost really becomes that which it represents or signifies, viz., the Holy Ghost. No one pretends that Cyril teaches this. Dr Pusey is at the trouble to show that he has no such meaning (35 37). No more does Cyril teach that the bread by invocation becomes the real body of Christ. Elsewhere Cyril also uses the act of consecration in regard to the sacramental elements as an illustration, as follows, ‘For as the bread and wine of the Eucharist before the holy invocation of the adorable Trinity, was simple bread and wine, while after the invocation the bread becomes the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ, so, in like manner, such meats belonging to the pomp of Satan, though in their own nature *plain* and *simple*, become profane by the invocation of the evil spirit.’ (15 7.) If Cyril believed that the bread by consecration had really become Christ’s body, it seems incredible that he should adduce this marvellous change to illustrate the change effected in idolatrous food by the invocation of the evil spirit. He plainly teaches that the bread after consecration had ceased to be mere bread, and had become a type of Christ’s body, (15 12), and that when communicants received the bread and wine, they were not ‘mere’ or ‘simple’ ‘bread and wine, but ‘the antitype of the body and blood of Christ.’ (15 15.) Cyril in like manner speaks of Baptism and Chrism as being antitypes. (15 9, 10.) No one considers that these antitypes were really and actually those things of which they were the antitypes. No more ought any one to consider that the antitypes of Christ’s body and blood were actually and really His body and blood. Cyril speaks of idolatrous food ceasing to be plain and simple after the invocation of the evil spirit, (15 7), and of ointment being no longer plain and simple after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, no one supposes that because Cyril speaks of those things ceasing to be plain and simple that they really became or were converted into that which they represented or

signified. No more when he speaks of bread ceasing to be simple, (15 7), and being mere bread no longer, (15 11), are we to infer that it really becomes or is converted into the body of Christ.

36. The special citations which Dr Pusey has made from Basil are as follow—‘Be holy and spotless, and so eat the ‘body and drink the blood of Christ.’ (28 24, 73.) ‘We ‘are entrusted with the body and blood of Christ.’ (28 25.) ‘Distribute the body of Christ.’ (28 26.)

37. Such citations are unworthy of notice, and will remain so until Dr Pusey or some other person proves that Basil understood such phrases literally. That he did not, we have given undoubted proofs from his own writings (16 1-4, 6, 9), all of which Dr Pusey has most unaccountably omitted.

38. There is one passage which Dr Pusey has cited in his larger work from Basil which requires notice. It is, ‘that ‘the participation of the body and blood of Christ is necessary ‘to everlasting life.’ “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except “ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, “ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and “drinketh my blood, hath eternal life;” and the rest.’ (16 8.) This is what our Lord Himself taught, as Basil shows by citing his words. Dr Pusey adduced this passage as an instance of sacramental participation. But Basil does not necessarily refer to a participation of this kind, and certainly not to a literal eating by the mouth, of the flesh and blood of Christ, but to a pure spiritual participation. It is currently admitted, as we have stated above (sec. 3), that Basil did not consider there was any reference in the sixth of St John to a sacramental, Eucharistic participation. He himself says, ‘Since our Lord is the true bread, and His flesh the ‘true meat, it is necessary that the pleasure and joy derived ‘from that bread should accrue to us through a mental taste.’ (16 2.) Again, ‘And he that eateth me, even he shall live ‘by me.’ For we ‘eat His flesh and drink His blood by being ‘made partakers through His incarnation and life, of sense ‘of the Word and Wisdom. For he called His whole mystical ‘course and conversation on earth His flesh and blood, and ‘signifies by them that doctrine, consisting of practical and

‘natural and theological teaching, by which the soul is nourished and is prepared for the contemplation of things.’ (16 9.)

39. The citations from Ambrose which Dr Pusey has chosen as the most important, are as follow—‘Touch not the body of Christ with a fevered hand.’ (28 27.) ‘Minister the body of Christ.’ (28 28.) ‘The body of the Lord Jesus, in whom is remission of sins.’ (28 29.) ‘The flesh of Christ, which is indeed the body of life.’ (28 30.) ‘In that sacrament Christ is, because it is the body of Christ; it is not therefore bodily food, but spiritual.’ (28 74.)

40. It is not necessary to dwell upon the first four of these citations, it being, as we have had frequent occasion to notice, the universal practice of the Fathers, when speaking of sacraments, to use sacramental language, and honour the signs with the titles of the names of that which they signify. The last extract is the most important. This part of the writings of Ambrose had been cited by Paschasius in defence of his heresy, but was clearly shown by Bertram to be against it. The sentence with its context is given, 17 15. How Bertram employed it against Paschasius may be seen 25 28-37. The use Dr Pusey made of the same passage in his largest work on the real presence, and our remarks thereon, will be found in chapters viii. 11-16, ix. 84 above.

41. The strength of the statements of the Fathers on the real presence, meaning that the real body and blood of Christ are in the consecrated elements, is no stronger than the most unfavourable statements which can be brought against it from any one of the accredited Fathers. If it were true that by consecration the elements become, or are converted into, the real body and blood of Christ, it would be so simply and importantly true that no one of the Fathers could have plainly said anything to call it in question, even in the most indirect manner, without being execrated as a heretic. But what is here affirmed of the whole of the Fathers may also be affirmed of the whole writings, or any part of the writings, of any one of the Fathers. For instance, the long passage cited both by Dr Pusey and Paschasius from Ambrose (33 22), in which the sentence in question occurs, although there is much seemingly in favour of the Paschasian doctrine, yet the evidence is in reality no

stronger than that which the most unfavourable sentence gives. Paschasius cited from Ambrose thus—‘ For in the sacrament ‘ there is the flesh itself of Christ, which was on the cross, and ‘ taken of the Virgin Mary, and the blood which flowed from ‘ His side.’ (33 22.) The weakest part of this statement is the word sacrament, that is, a sacred sign, and mark how Bertram cites and comments upon it.

“ It was surely the true flesh of Christ which was crucified, which “ was buried ; therefore this is truly the sacrament of His flesh. The “ “ Lord Jesus Himself proclaims, This is my body.” How carefully, ‘ how warily, is this distinction drawn,’ of ‘ the flesh of Christ, which ‘ was crucified, which was buried—that is, in respect of which Christ ‘ was crucified, &c., he saith, “ This was surely the true flesh of Christ ;” ‘ but of that which is received in the sacrament, he declareth, “ There- “ fore this is truly the sacrament of that flesh.” Here he distinguisheth ‘ between the flesh itself ; inasmuch as he saith that He was crucified, ‘ &c. ; but that the mystery, which is now performed in the Church, ‘ is the sacrament of that true flesh, in the which He was crucified. ‘ Here he openly teacheth the faithful, that the flesh in which Christ ‘ was crucified and buried is no mystery, but real and natural ; while ‘ the flesh which now, in a mystery, containeth the similitude of the ‘ former, is not flesh in its nature, but in a sacrament [sacramentally.] ‘ For in its nature it is bread, but in the sacrament it is the true body ‘ of Christ, as the Lord Jesus Himself says, “ This is my body.”’ (25 30, 32.)

Much of the force of the statement of Ambrose on which Bertram founds his remarks, is lost by the unfair translation which Dr Pusey has given of it. (sec. 17 15.) This passage is quite analogous to the one cited from the same part of the writings of Ambrose. ‘ In that sacrament Christ is, because ‘ it is the body of Christ ; it is not therefore bodily food, but ‘ spiritual.’ (28 74. 17 15.) Now Christ is not really, truly, and bodily in that sacrament, that is, sacred sign, but is in it, or there sacramentally by signification or representation, and is not therefore bodily food, but spiritual.

42. Ambrose in various parts of his writings uses as strong language in regard to eating Christ’s body and drinking His blood unsacramentally, as he does sacramentally. He represents Christ as food, and says, ‘ No food is sweeter than knowledge and doctrine.’ (17 1.) The blessing of Asher he interprets mystically in two ways, one as relating to the sacrament, the other as having no such relation. This part of the

writings of Ambrose, which in our edition of his works forms one paragraph, Dr Pusey has cited as two, with two independent references, leaving the reader to infer that in both passages Ambrose is referring to sacramental participation, whereas he only refers to the sacrament in the former instance, and although in the latter he uses strong language, he is not referring to the sacrament at all. The reader will do well to examine and compare the citations in the manner made by Dr Pusey, as given 17 2, 3, and he will there see how Ambrose in the latter section speaks of believers receiving the bread of life and living for ever, which Dr Pusey has adduced under the heading the 'Testimony to the belief in the Real 'Presence in the early Church—Ambrose.' But he does not there refer to any presence whatever in the sacrament, least of all in the consecrated elements. He represents the heavenly bread as the rain of spiritual wisdom (17 4), states that 'all food is not material, nor is all meat corporeal,' (17 5), and affirms 'that the reading of the Divine Scriptures 'is life.' (17 17.)

43. From Gaudentius Dr Pusey has quoted the following—
'From bread (because He can and hath promised), He
'maketh His own body; of wine, His own blood.' (28 35.)
This with its context has been considered, chapter xii. 108-111.

44. We now come to notice the special citations which Dr Pusey has made in his sermons from Augustine. 'He was
'carried in His own hands when commending His own very
'body to us, He said, "This is my body."' (28 36.) This
most unfair citation has been fully examined in chapter ix.
147-155. Dr Pusey further cites, 'We have heard the true
'master, the divine Redeemer, the tender Saviour, commend-
'ing to us our price, His blood, He spake to us of His body
'and blood. He called His body food; His blood drink.'
(28 37.) This considered in connection with its context as
given 21 107, can only relate to Christ's body and blood as
spiritual food. For Augustine founds his remarks on the
sixth of St John, which he interprets mystically and figura-
tively, and not literally. In a treatise in relation to the prin-
ciples of Biblical interpretation, he had occasion to give an

undoubted instance of a figurative portion of Scripture which must be understood figuratively. This, according to his judgment, he found in the sixth of St John, and how he states it, may be seen 21 13. Had Dr Pusey included this most important canon of Biblical interpretation in his 400 pages of citations, it would have destroyed seven-tenths of them, especially those which are founded upon the figurative phraseology of the sixth of St John.

45. Dr Pusey in his earlier sermon cites the following three passages from Augustine. 'In place of all those sacrifices and 'oblations, His body is offered, and is ministered to communicants.' (28 38.) 'We are fed from the cross of the Lord, 'because we eat His body.' (28 40) 'Eating, drinking the 'crucified.' (28 41.)

46. It is only necessary to remark in regard to these passages, that if they are to be understood literally as Dr Pusey would have his readers to understand them, then a very serious violation of the rules of Augustine is perpetrated. See chapter x. 4-14, 26-30.

47. The first of Dr Pusey's quotations in his sermons which we shall more especially notice, is, 'That everlasting 'Word equal to the Father, wherewith angels are fed.' (28 39.) This is almost as plain a contradiction as we could well have of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements. The passage no more proves that communicants now really eat the body which was crucified, and drink the blood which was shed by the soldier's spear (which is the doctrine of Paschasius and his disciple Dr Pusey), than that the Israelites in the wilderness did, and angels have ever done before Christ became incarnate. The passage, with a little more of the context is, 'man ate the bread of angels, as 'it is written, "He gave them of the bread of heaven. Man "did eat angels' food;" that is, that Word by which the angels 'live from everlasting, which is equal to the Father, did man 'eat; because, "being in the form of God, He thought it "not robbery to be equal with God;" by that are the angels 'filled.' (*In Ps. xxxiii.* [xxxiv.], tom. viii., p. 93.) We need not dwell upon the citation in question beyond observing, that the use which Dr Pusey makes of it has been condemned as

‘a fond thing,’ in the person of Paschasius, the father of the heresy, by Bertram, as the reader may see **25 16**. Dr Pusey quotes the following passage in his recent sermon, ‘The bread ‘which ye see on the altar, sanctified by the word of God, is ‘the body of Christ. That cup, rather what the cup holds, ‘sanctified by the word of God, is the blood of Christ.’ (**28 75**.) Now, had Dr Pusey cited this passage with its context to prove that the consecrated elements contained the bodies, souls, and spirits of all who are members of that body of which Christ is the Head, it would as well, if not better, have served for that purpose. Augustine, elsewhere addressing the same class of persons, says outright, ‘There ye are on the table, ‘and there ye are in the cup.’ (**24 28**.) The important quotation made by Dr Pusey in his recent sermon, has been well considered in connection with its context in other parts of this volume (See chapters ix. 91; xi. 95-97; xii. 112, 117.)

48. Before leaving Augustine, it will be well to notice one or two extracts from his writings which have not received the attention they deserve. A most important passage is given **21 5**, where, speaking of vows, he represents true believers as dwelling in the structure of the body of Christ, of which body the Lord’s Supper is the sacrament; and lest it should be thought that the way of salvation might consist in a good moral life only, he shows that there must be a participation of the body and blood of Christ (**21 5**.) Dr Pusey claims this passage in evidence of his doctrine of the real presence. Augustine has no necessary reference to a sacramental participation, but to a real vital one, whether sacramental or not, which must take place according to the most distinct teaching of Augustine before the sacramental participation can rightly be made. See chapters vii. 44, 45, and xi. 37.

49. He has cited many passages from Augustine, which, had they been given with more of the context, would not only have seemed unfavourable to a real presence in the consecrated elements, but would have been fatal to any such notion. An instance of this kind is given **21 23** nearly at the end. The passage thus cited considered in the light of what goes before, could not be intended by Augustine to be understood literally

for if so, he would have adduced evidence which would have been a direct contradiction of the very thing which he undertook to prove, namely, that blood is not life, but a sign of it, and that the life of all flesh is its blood, is a figure of speech, in which the sign is accustomed to be called by the name of the thing signified, of which he gives illustrations such as, 'The seven ears are seven years,' 'The Rock was Christ,' &c., &c. (21 23), and then makes the statement which Dr Pusey cites, which is as follows: 'But since the Lord says, "Except " ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you," ' why were the people so strictly forbidden the blood of the ' sacrifices which were offered for sins, if by those sacrifices ' this one sacrifice was signified, wherein is the true remission ' of sins; while yet the blood of that sacrifice itself, not only ' is no man forbidden to receive for nourishment, but rather ' all who wish to have life, are exhorted to drink.' (21 23.) This passage is not of the slightest use for Dr Pusey's purpose, unless Augustine understood the words in relation to drinking the blood of Christ literally, and not figuratively. But it is quite certain that he understood them figuratively, and not literally. With Augustine, blood was not life, but a sign of life. In allusion to this spiritual participation of the sixth of St John, he says, 'Assuredly, He who could ascend whole, could not ' be consumed. . . . Let them, then, that drink, drink; let ' them thirst, let them drink life. That drinking, what is it ' but to live? Eat life, drink life: thou shalt have life, and ' the life is entire.' (21 107, 108.) But more on this point in our remarks on the next citation of Dr Pusey to be noticed. He says, 'I have suppressed nothing; I have not knowingly ' omitted any thing' (35 41). Now had his knowledge been a little increased, so as to have included one of the best known sentences of Augustine, as given 21 13, that very passage in the order of Dr Pusey's citations would have immediately preceded the citation under consideration (21 23.) So far, then, is Augustine from considering our Lord as referring to a literal drinking of His blood, that he regarded it as 'a disgraceful thing or a crime.'

50. Another brief citation made by Dr Pusey regardless of the context is, 'The Lord hesitated not to say, "This is my

“body,” when He gave a sign of His body.’ (21 35.) This, as may be seen from the context, is an illustrative argument in proof that blood is not life, but the sign of it. Let the reader consider well this brief citation in connection with what goes before and comes after, as given 21 35, 36, and he cannot but conclude that the doctrine of Paschasius and of his disciple Dr Pusey is utterly condemned.

51. Another passage is given, 21 24, which shows distinctly that in the mind of Augustine there was no necessary connection between the outward and visible sanctification of a sacrament, and the inward sanctification, nor between the outward sign, and the grace or thing signified thereby. It is true he is more directly speaking of the sacrament of Baptism, but doubtless the principle equally applies to the Lord’s Supper. He instructs us that the Lord’s invisible grace is in very deed the whole fruit of the visible and outward sacraments, and teaches that the invisible grace may not be present in the sacrament, and may be really received without it, both of which points he fully illustrates and confirms from Holy Scripture. It is then plainly to be inferred from this part of Augustine’s writings, that the grace, or presence of it, is in the heart or soul of the believing recipient, and not in the outward visible sacrament. So that Hooker in his teaching upon this point does but repeat the sentiments of Augustine.

52. Dr Pusey, as well as all Roman Catholics, to prove that there is in the consecrated elements the real body and blood of Christ, maintains that the word sacrament in relation to the Lord’s Supper is not only a sign, but is itself that of which it is a sign, as, for instance, the consecrated bread is not only a sign, but is also the real body of Christ: (See chapter ix. 140, 141.) In fact, they make no real distinction between the sign and the thing signified. Dr Pusey, however, admits that the consecrated elements are symbols, figures, &c., but rigidly maintains that whoever receives the symbols, receives in them also the things of which they are the symbols. (See chapter x. 54-58.) As an additional proof to the many already given against this outrageous opinion, we refer the reader to an important passage from Augustine, given 21 43. There it will be seen that he undertook to explain an apparent paradox,

viz., that three diverse substances can be one substance. He regarded the human spirit of Christ and the water and the blood which flowed from His side as three sacramental substances of a diverse nature, but the realities of which they were the sacraments, namely, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as being of one substance, for he says, 'In sacraments, not what they are, but what they show, 'is always attended to, since they are signs of realities, one 'thing in substance, another in signification.' (21 43.) It is true that in this passage there is no direct allusion to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But Augustine's statement is of sacraments generally, and of course that sacrament could not be an exceptional case, especially as he elsewhere speaks of it after the same manner, saying, 'How is the bread His 'body? and the cup, or what the cup contains, how is it His 'blood? These things, brethren, are therefore called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another understood.' (21 135.) It is needless to remark that Christ's human spirit and the blood and water which flowed from His side though regarded by Augustine as sacraments, were not the realities of which they were the sacraments, namely, the three persons of the Holy Trinity, no more are the consecrated bread and wine the realities of which they are the sacraments. Plainly Augustine's explanation of the nature of sacraments forbids any such inference.

53. It has been noticed elsewhere that the Fathers regarded the phrase, 'This is my body,' as being much the same as if Christ had said, 'My body is this bread,' (see chapter xi. 45, 46 ; xii. 38, 48.) Jerome, or some other accredited Christian witness of antiquity, distinctly represents Christ in His Supper as transfiguring His body into bread. (18 59.) Augustine speaks as distinctly of Christ transfiguring His members into Himself, (21 46), and this union of Christ and believers he maintains is the chief reality of the sacrament and what is specially signified or represented therein. (See chapter xi. 88-97.)

54. Augustine speaks of sacramental signs as if, in his mind they were no more really that which they signify than any metaphor was really that of which it was a metaphor. Thus

he says, 'How many things signify Christ. All these things ('viz., sun, lamb, rock), are Christ in resemblance, not in 'proper signification.' (21 62, 63.) He makes an essential distinction between the nature of Christ and resemblances, even the resemblances which he calls sacraments. After speaking of the real nature of Christ, he remarks, 'The rest are 'resemblances. Understand, know how to hold Scripture, 'so that thou mayest see one thing put before thine eyes, 'another hinted to thine heart.' (21 63.) But he affirms this also of sacraments. 'For in sacraments not that which they 'are, but what they show, is always to be attended to, since 'they are signs of realities, one thing in substance, another in 'signification.' (21 43.) He also expressly speaks of sacraments as resemblances, saying, 'If sacraments had not a certain 'resemblance to those things of which they are the sacraments 'they would not be sacraments at all.' (21 3.)

55. Dr Pusey and High Anglicans commonly speak of the real presence of Christ's body which was crucified, and His blood that was then shed as being really present but spiritually. According to the plain teaching of Augustine, the spiritual presence of Christ implies His bodily absence. For he says, 'Therefore we do not rightly understand Him to have spoken 'these words, "While I was with them I kept them," save of 'those whom, believing on Him, He had already begun to 'keep by bodily presence, and whom He was about to leave 'by bodily absence, that He might, together with the Father, 'keep them by spiritual presence.' (21 102.) Moreover he speaks of mysteries or sacraments as corporal things. (21 37.)

56. Dr Pusey has quoted in his sermons more from Chrysostom than from any other of the Fathers, but as in the case of his other citations, so in these, he has not proved that Chrysostom in the use of sacramental language and figures of speech, wished them to be understood literally. Of the twenty citations we shall more especially examine twelve. The following eight we shall simply quote, 'To nourish us He 'spares not His own flesh and blood.' (28 42.) 'God invites 'us to His own table, and sets before us His own Son.' (28 44.) 'He left us His own flesh.' (28 45.) 'That same Christ 'which was crucified for us, makes them to become His body

‘and blood.’ (28 48, 76.) ‘He who receiveth the body in an impure soul defileth it.’ (28 50.) ‘Receive with insolence the body of Him who is Lord of all.’ (28 51.) ‘In a tumult the most holy blood of Christ was spilled.’ (28 52.) ‘We drink not water from the rock but blood from His side.’ (28 53.)

57. Whatever is here affirmed by Chrysostom of the body or flesh and blood of Christ to be of any service in support of Dr Pusey’s teaching, must be understood in an absolute literal sense. It seems incredible that Dr Pusey, or any other man, could so understand Chrysostom.

58. The following three citations are taken from one of Chrysostom’s homilies, ‘He giveth Himself to thee to be received within thee.’ (28 43.) ‘He commingleth Himself with us, and not by faith only, but in very deed maketh us His body.’ (28 55.) ‘That whereat angels gaze with awe, thereby are we nourished, therewith are we mingled, and we become the one body and the one flesh of Christ. He feeds us with His own blood, and by every means entwines us with Himself.’ (28 56.)

59. If these passages are to be taken literally, as Dr Pusey contends, the strongest statement of the whole is, that ‘Christ in very deed maketh us His own body.’ He cannot take this literally, no more ought we to take the others literally. The above passages with their context will be found 22 9, and they should be well considered in connection with the other portions of the same homily, of which they form a part as given 22 6-9. The strength of the entire passage in favour of the doctrine of the real presence in the elements is no stronger than its weakest part. Thus in answer to the heresy of Marcion he says, ‘For if Jesus did not die, of what are the consecrated elements the symbols?’ (22 7.) Now if the consecrated elements are symbols, as symbols they are not that of which they are the symbols. In this same homily he illustrates the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper by the sacrament of Baptism, from which we learn that the consecrated elements in the Lord’s Supper, no more really are, or contain, the things which they represent or signify, than does the water of Baptism. Thus in relation to the Lord’s Supper he says, ‘For Christ

‘hath given nothing sensible, but all things to be perceived
‘by the mind [He hath given] by means of things sensible.
‘So also Baptism; the gift is bestowed by a sensible thing,
‘that is, by water; but that which is done is perceived by the
‘mind, the birth I mean and the renewal. For if thou hadst
‘been incorporeal, He would have delivered thee the incorporeal
‘gifts bare; but because the soul hath been locked up in a
‘body, He delivers thee the things that the mind perceives
‘in things sensible.’ (22 9.) Here Chrysostom teaches plainly
that the realities of the sacramental symbols in both ordinances
are received by the mind, and not by the body. And as in
Baptism, what is received by the mind is not contained in the
element, so no more is that which is received by the mind in
the Lord’s Supper really contained in the elements. Chrysostom
then goes on to state, ‘How many now say, I would wish to
‘see His form, the mark, His clothes, His shoes. Lo! Him
‘thou seest, Him thou touchest, Him thou eatest, and thou
‘indeed desirest to see His clothes, but He giveth Himself to
‘thee, not to see only, but also to touch, and eat, and receive
‘within thee.’ (22 9.) In these words occurs one of Dr
Pusey’s citations. (28 43.) The whole of this must be
understood literally or figuratively. Assuredly Christ is not
seen in the consecrated elements by bodily eyes, or touched by
bodily fingers, no more is He eaten by the natural mouth or
received into the material frame. Doubtless the consecrated
elements which bear the titles of the things which they signify
may thus be seen, touched, eaten, and received, but as
Chrysostom says, Christ has given nothing sensible, but all
things to be perceived by the mind. He hath given, by means
of things sensible.

60. The other two passages cited from this homily, if
understood literally, teach not the real presence of Christ in
the consecrated elements, but the real presence of ourselves in
Him, and without doubt, Chrysostom and the Fathers generally
realised very vividly the believer’s real but spiritual
union with Christ, and considered that to be especially represented
in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and is, in fact,
according to the most certain teaching of Augustine, the

reality of the sacrament. Chrysostom then indulges in one of his highest flights of rhetoric as follows—

‘For neither was it enough for Him to be made man, to be smitten and slaughtered, but “He also commingleth Himself with us, and “not by faith only, but also in very deed maketh us His own body.” What then ought not he to exceed in purity, that hath the benefit of this sacrifice? Purer than the sunbeam should not that hand be which is to sever this flesh, the mouth that is filled with spiritual fire, the tongue that is reddened by that most awful blood? Consider with what sort of honour thou wast honoured, of what sort of Table thou art partaking! “That which, when angels behold, they “tremble, and dare not so much as look up at it without awe,” on account of the brightness that cometh thence; “with this we are fed, “with this we are commingled, and we are made one body and one flesh “with Christ.” . . . What shepherd feeds his sheep with his own limbs? and why do I say, shepherd? There are often mothers that after the travail of birth send out their children to other women as nurses; but He endureth not to do this, “but Himself feeds us with “His own blood, and by all means entwines us with Himself.”’ (22 9.)

This passage contains Dr Pusey’s other two citations, and are distinguished by double inverted commas. If he takes his own special citations literally, so must he also take the context in which they are found. If the literal flesh of Christ is eaten, then the devout eaters thereof are made, or become the very same flesh which they eat, and the eaters and that which is eaten are commingled and entwined together, and are one literal flesh and one literal body. It is needless to say that Chrysostom’s language cannot be so understood, and no one pretends that it can, and no one ought to pretend that it is the literal body of Christ which is eaten, unless in all consistency he also believes that ‘Christ in very deed maketh ‘us His body’ in the same sense of body as that which is believed to be eaten. Chrysostom is speaking of the ineffable and blessed union of Christ with all those who are His, and in expatiating on a theme so exalted, he, as was natural, used his peculiar gifts in depicting it.

61. The next citation to be noticed is, ‘That which was in the cup is that which flowed from His side, and thereof do we partake.’ (28 46.) This has already been considered in chapter x. 42, 43.

62. Another citation is, ‘He is really present, because the

‘sacrament is His body.’ (28 47.) This has been examined in chapter ix. 4.

63. Dr Pusey again gives us three extracts from one homily of Chrysostom, which are as follow :—‘His body is set before ‘us now.’ (28 49.) ‘If we will we have Him entire.’ (28 54.) ‘He has given us to be filled with His holy flesh. He ‘has set before us Himself sacrificed.’ (28 61.) If the reader will diligently compare these extracts with other portions of the homily, of which they form a part, as given 22 5, we think he will conclude that this attempt to prove the doctrine of the real presence in the consecrated elements is contemptible. The first two extracts, which Dr Pusey has cited on different pages in his sermon, form one passage in the homily of Chrysostom. These we shall exhibit with the context, distinguishing them by double inverted commas : ‘Let us also ‘touch the hem of His garment, or rather, “if we be willing “we have Him entire.” For indeed “His body is set before “us now,” not His garment only but even His body ; not for ‘us to touch only, but also to eat and be filled.’ (22 5.) Now if we debase the eloquence of Chrysostom, which was the most florid of all the Fathers, by regarding his words and phrases in this passage as logical, and not as highly rhetorical and figurative, as Dr Pusey must do to favour his notion of a real carnal presence, then doubtless Chrysostom teaches the real presence of the garment of Christ in the consecrated elements. Does Dr Pusey cite the phrase, ‘His body is set before us now,’ as a proof of its real presence in the consecrated bread ? He ought in all fairness with those words to have cited with them the four words immediately following, ‘not His garment only,’ and maintained the real presence of that also in the consecrated bread. Chrysostom exhorted his hearers to draw near with faith, and showed that in doing so the offering would not only be received, but would be touched with a pure heart. Doubtless he is here referring to a purely mental and spiritual participation of Christ, such a participation as could only be made by the faithful. His very language, too, implies that Christ Himself is not really in the consecrated elements, but in approaching, the communicant is to be so minded as if approaching Christ Himself. (22 5.) The common belief of Dr

Pusey and his school is, that whole Christ, God and man, is in the consecrated elements. (35 68, 39 9.) If Chrysostom had so believed, he could not have spoken thus; for of all the Fathers he would be the last to understate anything in regard to Christ and His sacraments. He goes on to speak of receiving Christ by faith, not only in the sacrament, but to hear His voice while He is speaking in the Evangelists, and endeavours to impress upon the minds of His hearers that the Eucharist duly celebrated according to Christ's command is that original Supper which He instituted, and at which He Himself sat down. (22 5.) For more on this point see chapter xii. 83.

64. As in the previous homily noticed above (sec. 59) Dr Pusey omitted citing what Chrysostom said in regard to Baptism (22 9), so also, in regard to this, he has made the same omission (22 5), and in so doing has kept from his readers an important key of interpretation to the language and sentiments of Chrysostom in regard to the other sacrament. In his large work on the Eucharist he cites Chrysostom thus: 'For He 'that hath given thee the greater, that is, hath set Himself 'before thee, much more will He not think it scorn to distribute unto thee of His body.' (22 5.) No one of Dr Pusey's readers possessing no more knowledge of this part of Chrysostom's writings than Dr Pusey here gives, could conceive that Chrysostom teaches that Christ Himself, the greater gift, has been set before the believer in Baptism, and that it is His body only that is given in the Eucharist. That is what Chrysostom plainly teaches, as may be seen from the context. (22 5.) Here immediately follows Dr Pusey's third quotation in his sermon from this homily, which, as cited in his notes, is, 'Of His own flesh He hath granted us our fill; He hath set 'before us Himself sacrificed.' (22 5.) We ask, does Chrysostom teach that Christ Himself was literally set before the believer in the sacramental element of Baptism? No one believes any such thing; no one ought to believe from what Chrysostom here says that the body or flesh of Christ is really set before the communicant in the consecrated bread, and whether he be saint or sinner, really and truly receives it. The phrase in the above citation, 'Of His own flesh He 'granted us our fill,' or, 'He has given us to be filled with

'His flesh' (28 61), is a peculiar expression frequently used by Chrysostom in this connection, and is a figure of speech borrowed from the book of Job (xxxi. 31), where we have, in the Greek Septuagint, 'O, that He would give us to be filled (or 'satisfied) with His flesh.' This figure of speech Chrysostom used as illustrative of eating the flesh of Christ, in the sixth of S. John, which, as we shall see presently, according to Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey, is the only figurative interpretation that is admissible in regard to eating the flesh of Christ in that chapter. (See secs. 67, 68, below.) Thus the very words which of all others employed by Chrysostom should be understood literally to be of any service to Dr Pusey, it is quite certain, as we shall very soon prove, them he understood and employed figuratively.

65. In this homily Chrysostom speaks exactly in the same manner of Christ's body of believing people as he does of the body in the Eucharist. Thus he says :—

'Wouldst thou do honour to Christ's body? Neglect Him not when 'naked; do not, while here [in the Eucharist] thou honourest Him 'with silken garments, neglect Him perishing without of cold and 'nakedness. For He that said, "This is my body," and by His word 'confirmed the fact, this same said, "Ye saw me a hungered and fed "me not;" and "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of "these, ye did it not to me." For this [body in the Eucharist] needs 'not coverings, but a pure soul; but that [body of the faithful] requires much attention. . . . For what is the profit, when His 'table indeed is full of golden cups, but He perishes with hunger? 'First fill Him, being a hungered, and then abundantly deck out His 'table also. Dost thou make Him a cup of gold, while thou givest 'Him not a cup of cold water? . . . What, again, if seeing one 'wrapped in rags, and stiff with cold, thou shouldest neglect giving 'Him a garment, and build golden columns, saying, thou wert doing it 'to His honour, would He not say that thou wert mocking, and account 'it an insult, and that the most extreme? . . . Why, then, doth 'He Himself say, "The poor always ye have with you, but me ye have "not always." . . . To revive her He said these things. For in proof 'that for her comfort He said it, He added, "Why trouble ye the "woman?" and with regard to our having Him really always with us, 'He saith, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the "world."' (22 5.)

In the same sense in which the word body is used in relation to Christ's people, in the same sense must the word be understood in relation to the Eucharist. Doubtless in neither case

did Chrysostom mean his language to be understood literally. It is quite certain that he speaks as distinctly of the real spiritual presence of Christ with His people out of the sacrament, as in it. We shall see immediately that with Chrysostom, as well as with Augustine and other Fathers, the reality or thing signified by the sacrament was the union of Christ with His people, but of course that union must subsist before the sacrament could be a sign of it. For more upon this subject see chapter xii. 98-102.

66. Another extract made by Dr Pusey is, 'That same 'flesh whereby He became akin to us, He gives forth to us. 'Wishing to show the longing He hath towards us, He hath 'mingled Himself with us, and blended His body with ours, 'that we might in a manner be one thing, as the body joined 'to the head.' (28 57.) This passage is more correctly given 22 13. It is certain that in this passage, considered in the light of its context, Chrysostom is more especially dwelling upon believers being made really present in Christ, or Christ in them, than upon any presence of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine. Beyond all question, Chrysostom is here speaking of the union which subsists between Christ and His body the Church. The question is, how did this originate? Certainly not in the Lord's Supper, but, as Chrysostom most distinctly teaches, by faith without any necessary connection with a sacrament. (22 32.) The next step in this important matter was Baptism, where, according to the doctrine of Chrysostom and the Fathers generally, the mingling and commingling of believers with Christ, and He with them, is represented, or is more especially said to be done. How Chrysostom speaks upon this subject may be seen 22 30. In connection with the very passage cited by Dr Pusey, Chrysostom alludes to what in his belief more especially took place in Baptism. He says, 'Wherefore it is necessary to understand the marvel of 'the mysteries, what it is, why it was given, and what is the 'profit of the action. We become one body, and "members "of His flesh and of His bones." Let the initiated follow 'what I say. In order, then, that we may become this, not 'by love only, but in very deed, let us be blended into that 'flesh.' (22 13.) Then comes the passage cited by Dr Pusey.

It is difficult to see the relevancy of such a quotation, and what it has to do with the purpose for which he quoted it, viz., the real presence in the elements. According to Chrysostom, our being made members of Christ's body, of His flesh and of His bones, is said to take place in Baptism, as in that holy ordinance it is professed and openly recognised before the Church. (See especially 22 30.) It is true, Chrysostom, in the citation in question, speaks of 'Christ giving forth His flesh to us' (28 58), or, as more correctly cited in the notes, 'The food which He hath freely given us.' (22 13.) But we have no ground whatever for believing that Chrysostom understood Christ to teach a literal participation of His flesh which was born of the blessed Mary and crucified on the cross, as Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey most outrageously teach; his own plain teaching repels the very idea. He did not quite make up his mind whether Christ, by calling Himself bread, meant His doctrine or His sacramental body. He says, 'He meaneth here,' or more literally translated, 'But here He calls either His own saving doctrines, and the faith which is in Him, or His own body, bread, for both nerve the soul, yet in another place He said, "If a man hear my saying he shall never taste of death."' (22 13.) Is it conceivable that if Chrysostom had really believed that Christ's flesh was to be as literally eaten as Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey represent he could have spoken thus?

67. The question is, did he understand the eating of Christ's flesh in the sixth of St John literally or figuratively? This admits of a plain answer, and in giving it we shall call in the aid of the above named Doctors. Dr Wiseman, in his attempt to prove that Christ in His discourse at Capernaum respecting eating His flesh meant that of His person as the man Christ Jesus, and to be eaten or received by the natural mouth, reasons thus—

'If the phrase *to eat the flesh* of a person, besides its literal sense, bore among the people whom Jesus addressed a fixed, proverbial, unvarying, metaphorical signification, then, if he meant to use it metaphorically, I say, that he could use it only in that one sense; and hence our choice can only lie between the literal sense and that usual figure. Now I do assert that, whether we examine the phraseology of the Bible, &c. . . . we shall find the expression to eat *the flesh of a person* signifying invariably, when used metaphorically,

'to attempt to do him some serious injury principally by calumny or false accusation. Such therefore was the *only* figurative meaning which the phrases could present to the audience at Capernaum. 'It is so in Hebrew. "While the wicked," says the Psalmist, "draw "near against me, to eat my flesh." (Ps. xxvii. 2.) This expression, 'as commentators have marked, describes the violent rage of his enemies, and the lengths to which they were ready to go against him. Job xix. 22, is the same phrase, but spoken of calumniators. "Why do you persecute me, and are not *satisfied with* [eating] *my flesh?*" Again, Micah iii. 3, we have "Who eat the *flesh* of my "people." (34 6.)

Dr Pusey, the disciple, very briefly but tersely, expresses the sentiments of his master thus—"It were an unexplained 'and unexampled metaphor, that to eat His flesh were to 'believe in Him; the more so, since in that language such 'metaphor is only used of preying upon a person or one's self, 'or of calumniating. The metaphor is from wild beasts, 'Ps. xxvii. 2; Mic. iii. 3. "Why do ye persecute me, and "are not satisfied with my flesh?" Job xix. 22. (35 71.) For these Doctors to shut us up to this metaphorical interpretation, if we reject their literal one, is simply ridiculous, and their private unfounded dictum is a flat contradiction to the plain teaching of the Fathers, who, while they do not accept their literal interpretation of our Lord's words in the sixth of St John, equally reject their only figurative interpretation, which they hold to be admissible. Especially Clement of Alexandria (9 1, 2, 4, 5); Tertullian (10 6); Origen (11 3, 21, 28, 29, 33-37); Eusebius (14 5, 6); Cyril of Jerusalem (15 12); Basil (16 2, 4, 19); Jerome (18 49, 50-52); and Augustine (21 13, 58, 59, 69, 93, 103.)

68. Now it so happens that Chrysostom, although agreeing with his brethren in the spiritual interpretation of the sixth of St John, yet also accepts the very alternative to which these Doctors would confine us, in case we refuse to accept their grossly literal interpretation. For immediately after the words cited by Dr Pusey (28 57), he goes on to state, 'For 'this belongs to them who love strongly; this, for instance, 'Job implied, speaking of his servants, by whom he was 'beloved so exceedingly, that they desired to cleave unto his 'flesh. For they said, to show their strong love which they 'felt, "Who would give us to be satisfied with his flesh?"

‘Wherefore this also Christ hath done, to lead us to a closer friendship, and to show His love to us ; He hath given to those who desire Him, not only to see Him, but even to touch and eat Him, and fix their teeth in His flesh, and to embrace Him, and satisfy all their love.’ (22 13.) Dr Pusey, as may be seen, has here quoted what immediately precedes and follows the part relating to Job, but that part he has omitted to quote. Whether Chrysostom is right or wrong in using such a remarkable figure of speech as an illustration of the language of our Lord, does not in the least affect the value of his testimony ; in either case, he understood our Lord’s words not literally but figuratively, as he did those of Job. Chrysostom does not stand alone in his singular application of this text from Job. Gregory the Great, on the words ‘If the men of my tabernacle said not, O that we had of his flesh, that we might be satisfied’ (Job xxxi. 31) ; remarks, ‘Which same sentence may also be taken in mystery of the voice of our Redeemer. For “the men of his tabernacle” longed to be “satisfied with his flesh,” that is, whether the Jews in persecuting, or the Gentiles in believing. For both, the one set themselves, as it were, by consuming it to put an end to His body ; and the other desire to satisfy their hungering soul with His flesh, by the daily sacrifice of His immolating.’ (*Expos. Moral. lib. xxii. in xxxi. cap. ; Job, tom. i., col. 723.*) Dr Pusey affirms, ‘It were an unexplained and unexampled metaphor, that to eat His flesh were to believe in Him.’ (35 71.) Gregory the Great did not think so, for he plainly teaches that the Gentiles satisfied their hungry souls with Christ’s flesh *in believing* ; and to eat Christ’s flesh and drink His blood by believing was a sentiment frequently expressed by Augustine. (21 69, 72, 93, 103, 105.)

69. If Chrysostom had believed that the flesh of Christ was really eaten as these above named Doctors barbarously teach, it seems incredible that he should have exaggerated that mode of participation by representing the tongue as being made red with blood, of the participant fixing his teeth in Christ’s flesh, &c., &c. The thing is too horrible to conceive. Augustine considers if Christ’s words are to be taken literally,

that 'He seems to command a disgraceful thing or a crime, ' therefore it is figurative, commanding us to communicate in ' the passion of the Lord and sweetly and profitably to treasure ' up in our memory that His flesh was crucified and wounded ' for us.' (21 13.) Dr Pusey has cited this part of the writings of Chrysostom to prove the doctrine of the real presence in the consecrated elements which, to be of any service to him, must be understood literally. But what an insult to the memory and doctrine of golden mouthed John, sometime Presbyter of Antioch, and finally Archbishop of Constantinople !

70. The next citation which Dr Pusey gives is, 'Christ ' gives us of His flesh to be filled, drawing us to greater love.' (28 58.) Here again he is applying the words of the book of Job to the words of Christ, and as in the instance just noticed he is explaining our Lord's words by the only figurative interpretation which both Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey deem admissible. The extract with its context is given, 22 21. Such citations as these are plainly against Dr Pusey's doctrine, and not in favour of it ; he requires passages which teach a literal participation of Christ's real flesh, whereas these teach a figurative one, and the very one and only one which Dr Pusey acknowledges to be admissible.

71. Another passage cited by Dr Pusey is, 'That very body ' which sitteth above, is adored by angels, is nigh to the power ' incorruptible, of this do we partake.' (28 59.) This is utterly worthless for the purpose for which Dr Pusey has produced it. It occurs in a special discourse on Christ's body the Church, as may be seen 22 28, 29. Dr Pusey, by an incorrect interpolation, would make it appear as if Chrysostom was discoursing on the body which was crucified. He is really discoursing on Christ's body the Church, and only adverts to the crucified body. Such was his exalted conception of the union between Christ and His body the Church, that he makes no difference between Christ's body the Church and the body which was crucified. He says, 'Our discourse is concerning ' the body [not that which was crucified, but the body the ' Church,] and this differs nothing from that [which was crucified,] nor is it separate. As many of us are partakers of the ' body, as many of us as taste of the blood let us consider that

‘we taste of the blood of Him that sitteth above, that is adored ‘by angels, that is next to the power that is incorruptible.’ (22 29.) That Chrysostom considered that there was no essential difference between Christ’s body in the sacrament and His body the Church, admits of further confirmation from the same discourse, for he goes on to state, ‘He hath made us His ‘own body, He hath imparted to us His own body.’

72. The last citation we have to notice is, ‘He gives Himself for a spiritual feast and banquet.’ (28 60.) This, with its context, is given 22 4. It should be noted well that the Fathers in their use of the words ‘spiritual’ and ‘spiritually,’ mean what they say, and exclude by such defining words every thing which is not spiritual. The body which was born of Mary and crucified, like all other human bodies, was material and carnal. That Christ was born with a spiritual body, and from His incarnation ever had a spiritual body, is an opinion which Dr Pusey holds, but we have shown that it was not held by the Fathers, but condemned as heretical. (See chapter ix. 44-51.)

73. Before leaving the testimony of the Fathers it will be necessary to advert for a short time to Dr Pusey’s last sermon. As it contains his latest teaching on the real presence, it was thought desirable that the main parts of it should be added to our other extracts from his writings, and accordingly they are given 35, 69-74. More than 400 pages of this first volume were in print before it was published, but nearly the whole of it has been answered by anticipation, and little more will be necessary than to connect those extracts with the parts of this volume where the very same sentiments contained in them have been considered and answered. Dr Pusey’s belief as to what is really present in the consecrated elements from 1843 has been the same as that of modern Roman Catholics. His way of arriving at the same conclusion with them has been somewhat different, but, in his later writings, even in this respect he has approached much nearer to them. In 1855 he said, ‘The Fathers used words which do *not* express the ‘doctrine now currently received [transubstantiation]; they ‘use words which only in a vague way express change, without in the least implying of what sort that change is; still

'less implying any change of *substance*.' They do NOT use the *one* word, now used universally in the Roman Church, which *does* express change of substance (μετεσώσεις), or transubstantiation (35 35.) Dr Pusey, however, in 1865 accepts transubstantiation as believed by the Greek Church, which is quite as gross and absurd as that of the Roman Church. He says, 'Archbishop Plato, in the Greek Church, admits the 'term μετεσώσεις (transubstantiation), in a sense, which, if 'proposed to it, the English Church must accept.' (35 55.) If the reader will turn to chapter xii. 19-22 above, he will there see that according to the authentic statements of the Greek Church, transubstantiation, as held by it, is in no respect different from the doctrine as held by the Roman Church, but, if possible, it is more explicitly and grossly stated. What Dr Pusey then rejected in 1855, he accepts in 1865. In his recent sermon, his teaching on the real presence is in exact conformity with that of Rome, even in its most recent developments, as made and published by Dr Wiseman. This will be seen on comparing 35 69 with 34 18, 35 70 with 34 19, 35 71 with 34 6.

74. The following extract from the sermon is in exact accordance with the doctrine of transubstantiation. 'In our 'blessed Lord's words of institution, "This is my body," there 'is no mention of any symbol, He does not say "This bread ' "is my body," but "This thing which I give you is my ' "body."' (35 70.) But Dr Pusey in 1853 said with approval, 'S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, S. Macarius, 'Eusebius, Theodoret, Eustathius, S. Augustine, say, as did 'Tertullian, that the consecrated elements are symbols, types, 'antitypes, figures, images, of our Lord's body and blood.' (35 20.) Without doubt the Fathers generally so call the consecrated elements. See chapter x., 49-53 above. At that time he also admitted that 'the proposition, "This bread is ' "my body," could have no other meaning than that it was 'in some way both' (35 36); and gives a list of extracts from the Fathers to prove that, in their opinion, Christ calls the bread His body. Some of these extracts are included with others, and given chapter xii. 12, 13 above. In 1855 Dr Pusey believed, in accordance with the unanimous consent

of the Fathers, and contrary to the Roman Church, that the consecrated elements were symbols, signs, &c., and that Christ called bread His body ; but in 1871, against the consent of all antiquity, and in accordance with the Roman Church, he in effect denies that the consecrated elements are symbols, and that Christ said, or meant to be understood to say, that bread was His body.

75. Dr Pusey has cited the dream of Zwingle (35 69), after the manner of Dr Wiseman, and has made the same unfair use of it. This has been fully considered and exposed in chapter iv., 33, 34 above. Like Dr Wiseman too, he maintains that the phrase, 'It is the Lord's passover,' is neither figurative nor elliptical, but literal. He says, 'The words without doubt mean, "It is a passover to the Lord."' (35 69.) This has been shown to be contrary to the Bible, as interpreted by the most able and learned Roman Catholic commentators, as well as contrary to the universal consent of the early Church, and the ancient versions of Scripture. (Chapter iv. 8-48.)

76. What Dr Pusey states respecting 'communion' and 'participation,' in his sermon (35 72,) has already been fully considered and answered in various parts of this volume, more especially in chapters v. 8-16, and vii. 42-45. His teaching also respecting Christ having a spiritual body (35 73,) has been shown to be most contradictory to the plain statements of the Fathers (Chapter ix. 44-51.)

77. We shall conclude this chapter and take our leave of the Fathers by considering Dr Pusey's peculiar canon or rule, by which he would have them so read that the readers thereof may 'soon be convinced that Christians of old, learned or 'unlearned, believed in the real presence of "the body and "blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine."' Dean Goode had very truly and accurately stated, 'The Fathers give us reasons why the bread in the Eucharist is called Christ's body and the wine His blood, showing that they did not consider them to be so really, but only representatively.' (*The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist*, p. 241.) 'Hence the Fathers tell us that it is customary to call THE SIGNS in the Eucharist, as in other cases, by the names of THE THINGS

'SIGNIFIED by them, the consecrated bread and wine being 'styled the body and blood of Christ, as figuratively representing them.' (*Ibid.* p. 247.) Again, 'Dr Pusey's extracts 'form, as usual, a heterogeneous mass of passages on the 'general subject of the Eucharist, most of them at once disposed 'of by the consideration that the Fathers commonly called the 'signs by the names of the things signified by them.' . . . 'The fact that the signs are called by the names of the things 'signified, sweeps away at once the larger portion of Dr Pusey's 'testimonies.' (*Ibid.*, p. 541.) How the Fathers, and Augustine in particular, do teach respecting sacramental signs receiving the names of those things of which they are the signs, may be seen in chapter x. 1-29 above. To meet this kind of evidence as adduced by Dean Goode, Dr Pusey constructs his canon which, that it may be seen and well inspected, we have placed **35 52**. As it will be less offensive and more effectual to submit it to a test than verbally define its qualities, we shall adopt the former plan. Be it observed that it is a canon for Dr Pusey's interpretation of sacramental phrases. Now it must be admitted on all hands that the Fathers speak of sacraments in the style in which holy Scripture speaks of them. Do the Scriptures call bread the body of Christ? the lamb or its sacrifice the Lord's Passover? so do the Fathers. It will be proper then that we test this canon by a sacramental phrase of Holy Scripture. And what more suitable than the phrase, 'That Rock was Christ.' (1 Cor. x. 4.) If it be denied that this is strictly a sacramental phrase the answer is, it is so regarded by all the Latin Fathers, and by the great Augustine in particular, and that is sufficient for our purpose, for it is really a patristic and not a Scripture question which we are now discussing. In this instance, beyond all question in the mind of Augustine, the sign, the rock, is called by the name of that which it represents or signifies, as may be seen on reference to chapter x. 28, 29, above. Now let us apply the canon to the phrase in question, using substantially Dr Pusey's own words :—

'As loving and desiring to know the truth, let us examine for ourselves this passage of St Paul which we have adduced, and see 'whether we think that the word "rock" could be substituted for the

'word "Christ," and the meaning remain the same. For if that maxim 'of the great Augustine, and his disciples herein, Albertinus, and the 'school of Calvin, were true that "the signs are called by the name of "the things signified," and the inference which alone would make it 'bear upon this doctrine, also true, viz., that when "the apostle "speaks of the thing signified," "Christ," we are entitled to suppose "that he meant *only* the "sign," i.e., the rock, then, of course, we 'might, in every case which is so to be disposed of, substitute the 'word "rock " for "Christ," and the sense receive no damage. Let 'any one really and earnestly and perseveringly try this, and I feel no 'doubt that he would soon be convinced, at least, that Christians of 'old, learned or unlearned, believed in the real presence of Christ 'under the form of a rock.' (35, 52.)

One condition of the canon is that it be really and earnestly and perseveringly tried, and in accordance with this requirement we shall now directly apply it in the first instance to sacramental phrases of Holy Scripture, substituting as the canon requires the name of the sign for the name of the thing signified by the sign. 'That Rock was Christ.' That rock was a rock. 'This (circumcision) is my covenant.' (Gen. xvii. 10.) Circumcision is my circumcision. 'It (the lamb) is the 'Lord's Passover.' (Ex. xii. 11.) The lamb is the Lord's lamb. 'It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover.' (v. 27.) It is the sacrifice of the Lord's sacrifice. 'The sabbath '... a perpetual covenant.' (Ex. xxxi. 16.) The sabbath a perpetual sabbath. 'Blood of the covenant,' or its exact equivalent, 'Blood is the covenant.' (Ex. xxiv. 8.) Blood is blood. 'It (the shew-bread) is a perpetual covenant.' (Lev. xxiv. 8.) Shew-bread is perpetual shew-bread. 'Salt of the 'covenant,' or its exact equivalent, 'Salt is the covenant.' (Lev. ii. 13.) Salt is salt. 'This (the cup, or rather the 'wine contained in it) is my blood of the New Testament.' (Matt. xxvi, 28, Mark xiv. 24.) This wine is my blood of the new blood. The exact equivalent to the above, 'This 'cup is the New Testament in my blood.' (Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25.) This wine is the new blood in my blood. We have another part of the canon yet to apply to these sacramental phrases, which is, 'If that maxim of Augustine 'and his disciples Albertinus and the school of Calvin were 'true, [as it doubtless is,] "that the signs are called by the 'name of the things signified," and the inference which

‘alone would make it bear upon this doctrine, also true, viz.,’ that when Moses, St Matthew, St Mark, St Luke, and St Paul ‘speak of the things signified,’ the Lord’s Passover or Passing-over, and the Covenant made with Abraham made once and once for all, they meant *only* the “signs,” that is, circumcision, the passover lamb, the passover feast, or sacrifice, the shew-bread, the salt, the blood, &c. Is it conceivable that a man of such reputed eminence as a leader of a party in the Church, could construct a canon so utterly ruinous to the entire sacramental phraseology of Holy Scripture. Dr Wiseman, and in exact imitation of him, Dr Pusey, have denied that the above phrases from the Old Testament are sacramental, or even elliptical or figurative. We think it has been proved in the third and fourth chapters above that they are figurative, elliptical and sacramental. Both Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey, however, admit that the phrase, ‘That Rock ‘was Christ,’ is a figurative form of speech. (34 18, 35 15.) Augustine represents it as sacramental. Referring to the manna and the rock, he says, ‘Those were sacraments; in ‘signs they were diverse (from ours) in the thing signified ‘they are alike. In the visible form they drank one thing, ‘we drink another, which however signifies this same thing ‘in its spiritual virtue.’ (21 77.) According to the certain teaching of Augustine the sacraments of the Israelites though different in signs from ours, theirs being manna and the water from the rock, ours being consecrated bread and wine, yet were exactly the same in signification. To illustrate and confirm what Dr Pusey calls the maxim of the school of Calvin, Augustine states, ‘Nor may it be denied that sometimes the thing which signifies, receives the name of that ‘thing which it signifies. . . . For so also was the rock ‘called Christ.’ (Ch. x. 28 above.) Again, ‘A thing which ‘is a sign is accustomed to be called by the name of the thing ‘which it signifies. . . . Hence there is that which is said, ‘“The Rock was Christ.” For he did not say, “The Rock ‘signified Christ,” but as it were, was this very thing, ‘though indeed it was not this in substance, but in signification.’ (21 23; also Bede 24 24.) ‘It is not said the ‘rock signified Christ, but “the rock was Christ.” . . .

‘As then Scripture is wont to speak, calling the things ‘signifying as if they were the things signified.’ (21 100; also Bede 24 24.) Thus the very thing which Dr Pusey denies to be taught by the Fathers, and which he stigmatizes as a maxim of the School of Calvin, is the very exact thing which Augustine most explicitly teaches. But to substitute in the phrase, ‘That Rock was Christ,’ the word rock for the word Christ, and the meaning remain the same, is absurd, and equally absurd is it to suppose that in speaking of Christ is meant the sign only, and not Christ.

78. Augustine actually speaks much in the same style of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. In proof that although blood is called life, yet it is not really so, but only a sign of life, he states, ‘The Lord did not hesitate to say, “This is “my body,” when He gave a sign of His body. . . . For the blood was so life as the rock was Christ. Thus the apostle says, “For they drank of that rock which followed them, “and that Rock was Christ.” . . . He did not, however, say ‘the rock signified Christ, but said “the Rock was Christ.”’ (21 35, 36.) Again he expressly asserts, ‘The sacrament of ‘so great a thing he called by no other name than that of ‘the thing itself.’ ‘That sacraments for the most part ‘receive the names even of the things themselves. As, ‘therefore, after a certain manner the sacrament of the body ‘of Christ is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the blood ‘of Christ is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is ‘faith.’ (21 2, 3.)

79. The real aim and intent of this preposterous canon of Dr Pusey is to make it appear that all who do not believe as he and his fellow disciples of the School of Paschasius do, that the body which was crucified, and the blood then shed are really in the consecrated elements, regard the consecrated elements as unmeaning signs, and the Eucharist in which they are employed a barren and meaningless ceremony, whereas really nothing could be further from the truth. We appeal to the testimony of Zwingle as a witness. (See 29 12.)

CHAPTER XIV.

THE RESULT OF DR PUSEY'S OBSERVANCE OF A CANON OF INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE BY THE FATHERS, COMPARED AND CONTRASTED WITH THE RESULT TO WHICH JEWEL CAME, BY OBSERVING THE SAME CANON OF WHICH HE WAS THE CHIEF FRAMER. THE EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PROVED TO BE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME AS THAT OF OTHER REFORMED CHURCHES AND EVANGELICAL COMMUNIONS, AND THEREFORE MORE FITTED TO BE IN VISIBLE COMMUNION WITH THEM THAN WITH THE GREEK CHURCH. BISHOP BROWNE'S MISCONCEPTIONS RESPECTING THE EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE OF ZWINGLE POINTED OUT, AND A CORRECT STATEMENT OF HIS DOCTRINE GIVEN, WHICH IS SHOWN TO BE IN NOWISE DIFFERENT FROM THAT OF THE OTHER REFORMERS, EXCEPT LUTHER. BISHOP BROWNE'S INACCURATE STATEMENT RESPECTING THE EUCHARISTIC TEACHING OF THE FATHERS EXHIBITED, AND HIS WRONG CONCLUSION THEREFROM CORRECTED. ZWINGLE'S EUCHARISTIC TEACHING PROVED TO BE THE SAME AS THAT OF CALVIN, CRANMER, AND JEWEL, AS THEIR RESPECTIVE WRITINGS TESTIFY, AND BISHOP BROWNE SHOWN TO HAVE FAILED IN HIS ATTEMPTS TO PROVE IT OTHERWISE. THE SACRAMENTAL DOCTRINE OF CANON LIDDON, AS ADDUCED BY SIR ROBERT PHILLIMORE IN THE BENNETT CASE, CONSIDERED AND REFUTED, WITH A FULL EXPOSURE AND REFUTATION OF THE FALSE CHARGES AGAINST THE EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE OF ZWINGLE. BISHOP BROWNE'S GROUNDLESS COMPLAINT AGAINST ZWINGLE RESPECTING THE SPIRITUAL BODY OF CHRIST CONSIDERED, AND ZWINGLE'S VIEWS RESPECTING IT SHOWN TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DOCTRINE OF THE EARLY CHURCH. ALSO HIS OPINION RESPECTING THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S GLORIFIED BODY IN THE EUCHARIST SHOWN TO BE UNCATHOLIC AND CONTRARY TO SCRIPTURE. CANON LIDDON'S ATTITUDE AT THE LORD'S TABLE VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF ANTIQUITY, AND SHOWN TO BE SUPERSTITIOUS AND IRREVERENT. THE EUCHARISTIC TEACHING OF BISHOP MOBERLY AS CITED BY SIR ROBERT PHILLIMORE IN THE BENNETT CASE EXAMINED AND SHOWN TO BE SELF-CONTRADICTIONARY AND ALIEN TO THE DOCTRINE OF HIS OWN CHURCH AND THAT OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH, ESPECIALLY IN MAKING THE VALIDITY OF THE EUCHARIST TO DEPEND UPON A PARTICULAR ORDER OF MEN EXISTING ONLY IN THE IMAGINATION OF A FEW HIGH ANGLICANS.

1. The preceding pages have been almost wholly occupied in answering, from Holy Scripture and the Fathers, the Eucharistic doctrine of Dr. Pusey and that of his school. In this chapter we shall adduce the testimony of the leading divines of the Reformation period. With Dr Pusey, Ritualists, and High Anglicans generally, the doctrine of the Church of

England is determined by that of the ancient Church. Dr Pusey thinks too that this is the judgment of the Church itself, and in proof thereof, after a few words of preface, he cites, 'The rule which that Convocation which gave us the Articles recognised as its guide, "They (preachers) shall in "the first place never teach anything from the pulpit to be "religiously held and believed by the people, but what is "agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, "and collected out of that very doctrine by the Catholic "Fathers and ancient Bishops."' (35 40.) Doubtless Dr Pusey regards this rule of Convocation as binding upon all preachers of the Church of England, and of course binding upon himself. And if so, we solemnly charge him with a very gross violation of a rule which he thus accepts. For he has taught much in regard to the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements, both by his writings and 'from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people,' which is most contrary 'to the doctrine of the New Testament, 'and collected out of that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers 'and ancient Bishops.' He introduces the rule thus, 'The rule which that convocation which gave us the articles recognised as its guide.' Now of all the men who took part in that convocation, and in giving completion to the Articles, Bishop Jewel was the chief. It would be interesting to know what he preached, and what he wrote on the doctrine under consideration, as guided by a rule of which he was the chief framer, and which he was in the habit of recognising. Fortunately all the evidence required is at hand, and we shall now give practical illustrations as to the conclusion to which Jewel came, by following his own rule, in regard to the doctrine of the real presence, and the conclusion to which Dr Pusey came on the same subject by professedly following the same rule.

2. Bishop Jewel in the year 1560 preached a controversial sermon on the institution of the Lord's Supper, in which he maintained the views commonly held by all the Reformed Churches, and refuted some of the doctrines as held by the Church of Rome, and challenged his adversaries as follows:—

'If any learned man of all our adversaries, or of all the learned men

‘that be alive, be able to bring one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved that for the space of six hundred years after Christ . . . the people was then taught to believe that Christ’s body is really or substantially, . . . in the sacrament; or that His body is or may be, in a thousand places or more at one time; or that the priest did then hold up the sacrament over his head; or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour . . . or that whosoever had said the sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ’s body, had therefore been judged for a heretic . . . if any man alive were able to prove any of these articles by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, or of the old doctors, or of any old general council, or by any example of the primitive Church; I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him. . . . Wherefore, besides all that I have said already, I will say further, and yet, nothing so much as might be said. If any one of all our adversaries be able clearly and plainly to prove, by such authority of the Scriptures, the old doctors and council, as I said before, . . . that when Christ said, *Hoc est corpus meum*, (“This is my body”) this word *hoc* (this) pointed not to the bread, but *individuum verum*, as some of them say, . . . or that the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ that lieth hidden underneath it—if any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, doctors, or councils, as I have required,—as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him, and to subscribe. But I am well assured that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence, and because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest ye haply should be deceived. . . . But keep your hold; the doctors and old catholic fathers, in the points that I have spoken of, are yours; ye shall see the siege raised, ye shall see your adversaries discomfited and put to flight.—(*Sermon Preached at Paul’s Cross Works*), vol. I., pp. 20-22.

3. In a former part of the sermon he says, ‘O merciful God, who would think there could be so much wilfulness in the heart of man? O Gregory! O Augustine! O Hierome! O Chrysostom! O Leo! O Dionyse! O Anacletus! O Sixtus! O Paul! O Christ! If we be deceived herein, ye are they that have deceived us, you have taught us these schisms and divisions, you have taught us these heresies. Thus ye ordered the Holy Communion in your time; the same we received at your hand, and have faithfully delivered it unto the people.’—(*Ibid.*, p. 20.)

4. In regard to all these points as our extracts from Dr

Pusey's writings show, what Jewel has affirmed, Dr Pusey flatly denies, and what the former has denied, that the latter confidently affirms. Both appeal to the Fathers. Jewel was confident, as we have seen, that the Fathers of the first six centuries were on his side; and Dr Pusey has cited Fathers of the first 440 years of the Christian era, and so certain does he profess to be that they teach his sacramental doctrine, he even affirms, 'There is no flaw, no doubt, I might almost say, 'no loophole, except that man always finds one, to escape what 'he is unwilling to accept,' (35, 39.) Yet Dr Pusey in his attempts to adduce evidence in favour of his belief, has added little or nothing in addition to what had already been brought forward by Roman Catholics even before the time of Jewel against the Reformers. How well such men as Peter Martyr, Archbishop Cranmer, and his chaplain Becon maintained their doctrine against their opponents, their extant writings abundantly testify. Dr Pusey however has omitted much which these men and Jewel adduced against their opponents, although he says he has not knowingly omitted any thing. Now comes the question, was Bishop Jewel wrong and is Dr Pusey right? And let it be remembered that their teaching upon the question in dispute was as opposite as the poles. Bishop Jewel was right and Dr Pusey is wrong, egregiously wrong, outrageously wrong, and we allege the foregoing pages in proof.

5. It cannot be pretended that the leading English Reformers after the year 1552 believed or taught Dr Pusey's doctrine. But there are those who teach that although the Eucharistic doctrine of the English Reformers was very much opposed to the Roman doctrine it was equally opposed to the doctrine as held by nearly all the Protestant and Evangelical Churches. Cut off from all other Protestant Churches by the Act of Uniformity, and by sacramental doctrine too, if the above statement is correct, and having no communion with the Greek and Roman Churches, the isolation of the English Church is complete, and by all its position is felt to be anomalous and most unsatisfactory. A remedy for this evil is sought by a large and increasing party in the Church, not by having visible communion with sister Protestant Churches, but with

the ancient and alien Greek and Roman Churches. This party considers, too, that the teaching of the English Church, both as to the office of the ministry and as to the sacraments, renders it more fitting that it should be joined to the alien and apostate Greek and Roman Churches. In regard to the undoubted teaching of the Fathers of the first four or five centuries and that of the English Reformed Church of the latter half of the sixteenth century, as respects the office of the Christian ministry, it has been shown in a former work entitled *Whose are the Fathers?* that the Protestant and Evangelical Churches are our sisters, and not those harlots called Greek and Roman Churches. It remains now to be briefly shown that the doctrine of the Eucharist, as held by the leading Christian writers of the first seven or eight centuries, and as held by the leading writers of our Reformed Church, especially those of the latter half of the sixteenth century, should lead us to a reunion with the Protestant and Evangelical Churches, and keep us as far as possible from the corrupt Christian systems of Greece and Rome.

6. Dr Browne, the Bishop of Ely, in his *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, especially of the articles relating to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, makes it appear that the Fathers and the leading Reformers, with the exception of Zwingle and his followers, believed a real presence to be in the Eucharist, which now all Reformed and Evangelical Churches deny, even as Zwingle did. The inference, then, is, if the Church of England is true to its principles it must hold a doctrine in regard to a presence in the Eucharist essentially different from that of all other Reformed Christian Churches. The difference, then, is, as plainly stated by Bishop Browne, that while the Church of England believes, with all the Reformers, except Zwingle, that there is a real spiritual presence in the Eucharist, all the Reformed Churches, with Zwingle, deny that there is any presence whatever in the Eucharist. We shall now proceed to show that this is an unfounded assumption, and contrary to the most plainly recorded evidence, and begin by examining the Bishop's statements. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper he terms 'This mysterious doctrine.' (p. 677.) The doctrine, if correctly apprehended, is not more mysterious than any other revealed doctrine of Holy Scripture. We have

already shown that the Bishop has seriously misapprehended the teaching of Calvin and Hooker in making use of their influential names to magnify the supposed mystery of the Eucharist. (See chapter ix. 34-36.)

7. Bishop Browne says :—

‘On this mysterious doctrine there have been four principal opinions : 1. Transubstantiation ; 2. Consubstantiation ; 3. The real spiritual presence ; 4. The denial of any special presence altogether.’—(p. 677.) It is the third and fourth opinions with which we are more especially concerned. Of these he says, ‘The doctrine of a real spiritual presence is the doctrine of the English Church, and was the doctrine of Calvin, and of many foreign Reformers. It teaches that Christ is really received by the faithful communicants in the Lord’s Supper, but that there is no gross or carnal, but only a spiritual and heavenly presence there ; not the less real, however, for being spiritual. It teaches, therefore, that the bread and wine are received naturally, but the body and blood of Christ are received spiritually. The fourth opinion is that of Zwinglius, who taught that the Eucharist is a bare commemoration of the death of Christ, and that the bread and wine are mere symbols and tokens to remind us of His body and blood.’—(p. 678.)

This is a serious misconception of the doctrine of Zwingle, and practically, though not intentionally, a gross misrepresentation of it. The simple truth is, that the views of Calvin, Cranmer, and Jewel, on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist were identically the same as those of Zwingle, as we have already shown in chapter ix. 38-41 above. The plainest and most intelligent part of the Bishop’s mysterious teaching on the Eucharist is also pure Zwinglianism, where he cites Hooker’s words with approval, ‘The real presence of Christ’s most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament (*i.e.* in the elements) but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament.—(p. 709.) The Bishop, however, probably owing to his conceiving the doctrine of the Eucharist to be mysterious, flatly contradicts this in several parts of his exposition of the articles relating to the sacraments. Thus he says, ‘Zwingle rejected sacramental grace entirely’ (p. 594), which the Bishop condemns as an error. Again he says, ‘We, of the Church of England, who believe Christ really present in His sacraments.’—(p. 724.) ‘Now, the inward grace of the sacraments.’—(p. 730.) These phrases are a direct contradiction of the plain teaching of Hooker, which the Bishop

has accepted with approval. With Hooker the grace was in the worthy receiver of the sacrament, and not in the sacrament itself. That there may be no mistake respecting the undoubted teaching of Hooker, it shall be stated more fully :—

‘The real presence of Christ’s most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament. And with this the very order of our Saviour’s words agreeth—first, “Take and eat,” then, “This is my body which is broken for you.” First, “Drink ye all of this ;” then followeth, “This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.” I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ when and where the bread is the body, or the cup, His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him who receiveth them. As for the sacraments they really exhibit, but for ought we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really, nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them, or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow. If on all sides it be confessed that the grace of Baptism is poured into the soul of man, that by water we receive it, although it be neither seated in the water nor the water changed into it; what should induce men to think that the grace of the Eucharist must needs be in the Eucharist before it can be in us who receive it? The fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the body and blood of Christ. There is no sentence of Holy Scripture which saith that we cannot by this sacrament be made partakers of His body and blood, except they be first contained in the sacrament, or the sacrament converted into them.’—(*Eccles. Pol.*, book v., lxvii.)

8. Hooker not only teaches the doctrine of Zwingle, but also speaks of him with approbation, and classes him among the orthodox teachers of Eucharistic doctrine. He says, ‘This was it that some [Lutherans] did exceedingly fear, lest Zwingle and Ecolampadius would bring to pass that men should account of this sacrament but only as of a shadow, destitute, empty, and void of Christ. But seeing that by opening the several opinions which have been held, they are grown, for ought I can see, on all sides at the length to a general agreement that which alone is material, namely, the real participation of Christ, and of life in His body and blood by means of this sacrament.’ (*Ibid.*) Again he states, ‘It seemeth therefore much amiss, that against them whom they term Sacramentaries so many invective discourses are made, all running upon two points, that the Eucharist is not a bare sign or figure only, and the efficacy of His body and blood is

‘not all we receive in this sacrament. For no man, having read their books and writings which are thus traduced, can be ignorant that both these assertions they plainly confess to be most true. . . . That strong conceit which two of the three have embraced [viz., Roman Catholics and Lutherans,] as touching, a literal, corporal, and oral manducation of the very substance of His flesh and blood, is surely an opinion nowhere delivered in Holy Scripture. . . . So that they all three do plead God’s Omnipotency; Sacramentaries, &c. The patrons of transubstantiation, &c. The followers of consubstantiation, &c.’ *Ibid.*

9. Hooker knew much more respecting the real sentiments of Zwingle than the Bishop appears to have done, and consequently has made an essentially different classification of opinions respecting the doctrine of the real presence. Them whom the Bishop has classed under two heads, viz., holders of the doctrine of the real presence, and deniers of any special presence altogether, Hooker has classed under one head, viz., Sacramentaries, and included himself and his Church among them. But Bishop Browne seems to allude to Sacramentaries and speak of them as if they were heretics very much in the same style as the Roman Catholic heretics do. Thus, speaking of the sentiments of Justin, he says, ‘There is manifestly in this passage what may be called high Eucharistic doctrine. Justin was plainly no Zwinglian. The Christians of his day took not the consecrated elements for “common bread and common wine.” But, if Justin was no Sacramentarian, &c.’ p. 687. We have no evidence in the writings of Justin to prove that with him the sacrament or mystery, or what soon after his day was commonly so called, was, or contained that of which it was a sacrament or mystery. He doubtless was a Sacramentary or a Sacramentarian. Neither did Zwingle regard the consecrated elements as ‘common bread and wine.’ For he says, ‘We have spoken above of sanctified and consecrated bread, which we intend in no manner to be taken in the sense of the Papists, as if the bread was converted into the body of Christ really or naturally, but into the sacramental body, for example, if daily bread is sanctified by word and prayer, much more that bread which is changed

‘that it may now be the sacramental body of Christ, that which was common before is sanctified and consecrated, that it may be divine and holy bread.’ (29 9.) ‘Which symbols we value not according to the worth of their matter, but according to the greatness of the thing signified, that now it is not common bread, but holy ; it has not only the name of bread, but also of the body of Christ.’ (29 20.)

10. The Bishop, speaking of Calvin, says, ‘Having stated the view of the Sacramentarians, that to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ is merely to believe on Him.’ p. 703. Calvin there stated no view whatever connected with sacramental participation, as we shall see presently when the passage is more fully cited for another purpose. Calvin, like Hooker, numbered himself among the Sacramentarians. Thus he says, ‘This good zealot [a Lutheran] saw clearly that all whom he styles Sacramentarians have one same faith, and confess it as with one same mouth, and even if the two excellent doctors, Zwingli and Oecolampadius, who were known to be faithful servants of Jesus Christ, were still alive, they would not change one word in our doctrine.’ (30 22.) ‘All who expound the words of Christ otherwise than according to the letter, as it is called, he hesitates not to style Sacramentarians. I am pleased with the terms ; for in this way Augustine is brought into our ranks. He wrote in answer to Faustus, that our Lord said, “This is my body,” when he was giving a sign of His body. Seeing he expounds the words of Christ figuratively, he will no doubt be regarded as a Sacramentarian.’ (30 28.)

11. Calvin also denies that sacraments contain or bestow grace. He states, ‘They do not of themselves bestow any grace.’ (30 7.) The sacraments do not confer grace. (30 25.) Jewel, a learned and able sacramentarian, says, ‘But sacraments are said to contain the grace of God, because they signify the grace of God. The grace is in the minds or souls of the receivers, not in the visible signs or sacraments.’ (32 6.)

12. Perhaps it may be said that this direct contradiction which appears between what Hooker, Calvin, and Jewel say of sacraments, and what the Bishop says of them, arises from the fact that these learned doctors used the word sacrament in one

sense, and the Bishop in another. The Bishop understanding and using the word as defined in the Church of England Catechism, whereas these illustrious divines used the word as defined by Augustine, viz., that a sacrament is a sacred sign. (21 1, 28.) Had the Bishop pointed out this necessary distinction, he could not have even appeared to make out a case against Zwingle at all, and as we have seen in condemning him as a sacramentarian, he really just as much condemned Calvin, Jewel, and Hooker. Nay, it would have been more pardonable if he had condemned all or any of these three rather than Zwingle himself, for will it be believed that Zwingle did not approve of the ancient definition of a sacrament, and that he and his disciples first brought into use the definition as given in our Church Catechism. This has been fully shown in chapter x. 21-24 above, and it is not necessary to repeat it here.

13. Even to show yet further how grievously Bishop Browne has misconceived and therefore misstated the teaching of Zwingle and his followers, we here give the testimony of a learned Bishop of our own Church, who is in great favour with the party called High Churchmen. Cosin, in his excellent treatise on Transubstantiation, states :

‘ Luther was once of opinion that the divines of Basil and Strasbourg did acknowledge nothing in the Lord’s Supper besides bread and wine. To him Bucer, in the name of all the rest, did freely answer, “That they all unanimously did condemn that error; that neither they, nor the Switzers ever believed or taught any such thing; that none could expressly be charged with that error except the *Anabaptists*; and that he also had since been persuaded that Luther in his writings attributed too much to the outward symbols, and maintained a grosser union of Christ with the bread than the Scriptures did allow; as though Christ had been corporally present with it, united into a natural substance with the bread: so that the wicked as well as the faithful were made partakers of grace by receiving the element; but that their own doctrine and belief concerning that sacrament was, that the true body and blood of Christ was truly presented, given, and received, together with the visible signs of bread and wine, by the operation of our Lord, and by virtue of His institution, according to the plain sound and sense of His words; and that not only *Zwingle* and *Æcolampadius* had so taught, but they also, in the public confessions of the Churches of the upper Germany, and other writings, confessed it;

“so that the controversy was rather about the manner of the presence or absence, than about the presence or absence itself.” All which Bucer’s associates confirm after him.—(*Chapter* ii. 13, pp. 20, 21.)

14. This same author also gives extracts from the Zwinglian confessions in proof of what he maintains. He states—

‘The more ancient Confession of the Switzers, made by common consent at Basil, and approved by all the Helvetic Protestant Churches, hath it, “that while the faithful eat the bread, and drink the cup of the Lord, they, by the operation of Christ, working by the Holy Spirit, receive the body and blood of our Lord, and thereby are fed unto eternal life.” But notwithstanding that they affirm, that this food is spiritual, yet they afterwards conclude: “That by spiritual food they understand not imaginary, but the very body of Christ which was given for us.” And the latter Confession of the Switzers, writ and printed in 1566, affirms as expressly the true presence of Christ’s body in the Eucharist thus: “Outwardly the bread is offered by the minister, and the words of Christ heard, take eat, this is my body, drink ye all of this, this is my blood. Therefore the faithful receive what Christ’s minister gives, and drink of the Lord’s cup; and at the same time, by the power of Christ working by the Holy Ghost, are fed by the flesh and blood of our Lord unto eternal life, &c.” Again, “Christ is not absent from His Church celebrating His Holy Supper. The sun in heaven, being distant from us, is nevertheless present by his efficacy; how much more shall Christ the sun of righteousness, who is bodily in heaven, absent from us, be spiritually present to us by His life-giving virtue, and as He declared in His last supper He would be present, whence it follows that we have no communion without Christ.”’—(*Chap.* ii. 17, 18, pp. 24-26.) Other extracts from these same Confessions will be found in chapter ix. 130 above.

15. Evidence of this kind needs no comment: it speaks for itself. But Bishop Browne cites passages both from the writings of Zwingli himself and from Calvin, in proof of what he affirms of Zwingli. These in all fairness must be examined. Respecting Zwingli he says, ‘The great leader among the reformers, of those who took an opposite view to Luther, was Zwingli. He was not satisfied to reject a material presence; but he even denied a presence of any sort. With him the bread and wine were empty signs. Feeding on Christ was a figure for believing in Him. The Communion was but a ceremony to remind us of Him. Spiritual manducation was resting upon the mercy of God.’ (p. 702.) In proof of these statements the bishop gives a

few scraps from four folio volumes of the writings of Zwingli which no better represent his real sentiments than would a few bricks or stones represent the structure of a splendid mansion when arbitrarily chosen by one who was prejudiced against the building. That these extracts may have their full effect, we here re-produce them with only the difference of giving them in English and not in the original Latin. “To eat sacramentally cannot be any other thing than to “eat the sign or symbol.” (*De vera et Falsa Religione, Opera Zwinglii*, pars. 2, tom. i., fol. 215.) ‘He denies that there can be any spiritual body of Christ, except His Church.’ (fol. 216.) Again, “A sacrament is the sign of a sacred “thing ; when therefore I speak of the sacrament of Christ’s “body, I mean no more than that bread, which is the figure “and type of Christ’s body which died for us.” (*De Cena Domini*, *Ibid.*, fol. 274.) “To eat the body of Christ “spiritually, is no other thing than in spirit and in mind to “depend on the mercy and goodness of God through Christ.” (*Fidei Christianæ Expositio*, *Ibid.*, fol. 555.)

16. We shall consider these extracts in the inverse order, beginning with the last first. This with more of the context is given (29 15) where Zwingli goes on to say, ‘That is with ‘an unshaken faith to be assured that God will grant to us ‘the pardon of sin and the joy of eternal blessedness for the ‘sake of His son.’ In this citation there is a seeming contradiction between the manner in which Zwingli speaks of participating of Christ’s body and blood, and the manner in which Calvin speaks of it whether in the sacrament or apart from it. The difference however is but verbal and not real, as will be fully shown when we come to notice the citations which the bishop has made from Calvin against Zwingli. (See secs. 19, 20 below.) How imperfectly this citation represents the teaching of Zwingli, the reader may see for himself by examining other extracts from the same treatise some which immediately precede, and others which immediately follow the extract in question as given. (29 13-23.) We beg the reader to consider well every statement. There is one passage which Dr Pusey might have cited to prove that Zwingli held the doctrine of the real objective presence,

The passage is, 'By these very symbols, that is, bread and wine, Christ Himself is presented to our eyes, that so not only now being heard, but also seen and tasted, they see and perceive Christ whom the soul has in its bosom and rejoices in Him. (29 13.) We say Dr Pusey *might* have cited this passage, because he has cited a similar one from Clement to prove the doctrine of the objective presence as may be seen (35 74), where from Clement he cites the words, 'For us to lay up Christ in ourselves and place the Saviour in our breasts.' These words, with more of the context, are given (9 3) at the close, and have been already noticed in chapter xiii. 25 above. Should it be said that thus to cite Zwingle would be contrary to the context, the answer is, he has so cited Clement in utter disregard of the context, as may be seen by an examination of it as given (9 1-5.)

17. The next extract to be noticed is, 'A sacrament is the sign of a sacred thing : when therefore I speak of the sacrament of Christ's body, I mean no more than that bread which is the figure and type of Christ's body which died for us.' Here Zwingle is making use of Augustine's definition of a sacrament as expressed in his words (21 1, 28), and as understood in that sense in relation to the consecrated bread it is neither more nor less than a symbol of Christ's body. This is the light in which Augustine regarded the word sacrament, as we shall see presently, and as Zwingle shows. He in other parts of his writings follows a more modern definition of a sacrament such as that given in our Catechism, of which he was probably the chief originator, as we have stated in chapter x. 21-24 above. Following his own definition of a sacrament, he explains proper sacramental eating to be a participation not only of the sign, but also of the thing signified by the sign. In the same treatise from which the bishop made the citation, we have already noticed that Zwingle says, 'You properly eat sacramentally, when you do the same thing inwardly, which you perform outwardly. . . . But they are said to eat sacramentally improperly, who indeed eat the visible sacrament or public symbol, but have not faith in the Lord.' (29 16.) We need not dwell longer upon this extract, as the very point which it contains occurs

in the extract which we have yet to notice, which is, 'To eat sacramentally cannot be any other thing than to eat the sign or symbol.' Here beyond all question Zwingle is not explaining any sacramental opinions of his own but those of Augustine, as may be seen by comparing the extract with its context as given (29 4, 5.) After citing several passages from different Fathers, he dwells more especially upon one from Augustine, which is, 'This, then, it is, to eat that meat and drink that drink : to dwell in Christ and to have Christ dwelling in him, and therefore, who dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt doth neither spiritually eat His flesh nor drink His blood, although carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ ; but rather doth unto judgment to himself eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing.' (21 84.) The reader has only to consider well Zwingle's remarks upon the words in which the citation in question occurs as given (29 5), and he will see the justness of Zwingle's remarks respecting Augustine's account of sacramental eating when the sacrament or 'sign of the sacred thing' only is eaten, but not the sacred thing itself, and will not fail also to notice the injustice of the bishop in thus so unfairly citing Zwingle.

18. The Bishop also says, 'Zwingle denies that there can be any spiritual body of Christ, except His Church.' The passage on which the Bishop founds his remark is in immediate connection with that part of Zwingle's writings which we have just noticed. (29 6.) We shall have to recur again to this important point, and shall defer it until then. (See sec. 39-44 below.)

19. But Bishop Browne cites Calvin in condemnation of the doctrine of Zwingle, and certainly no man of the Reformation period could bear more weighty or competent testimony. The Bishop states, 'Calvin took a middle course between Luther and Zwingle. With the former he acknowledged a real presence of Christ in His Supper, with the latter he denied a corporeal or material presence. Having stated the view of the Sacramentarians, that to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ is merely to believe on Him,

'he says, "But to me,"' &c. (p. 703.) Again the Bishop states, 'Thus, then, to receive Christ in the Eucharist is not merely to believe in Him, yet it is by faith we are enabled to receive Him. By believing we eat Christ's flesh, because by faith our feeding on Him is effected; and that feeding is the fruit of faith. "With them," (*i.e.*, the Zwinglians), Calvin writes, "the feeding is faith; with me the power of feeding comes as a consequence of faith,"' (p. 704.) By referring to 30 9, the reader will find the citations marked by brackets which the Bishop has made from Calvin, and will there see from the context that Calvin makes no reference whatever to sacramental eating, but to the mode of eating the flesh of Christ, whether in the sacrament or apart from it. He is especially referring to the eating of Christ's flesh in the sixth chapter of St John, which he denies to be sacramental. Thus in the very chapter from which the Bishop has made his citations, Calvin says, 'When Christ called Himself the bread of life, He did not take that appellation from the sacrament, as some perversely interpret. . . . Wherefore He once gave Himself, that He might become bread, when He gave Himself to be crucified for the redemption of the world; and He gives Himself daily, when in the word of the gospel He offers Himself to be partaken by us.' (30 8.) Elsewhere he says, 'This discourse (the sixth chapter of St John), does not relate to the Lord's Supper, but to the uninterrupted communication of the flesh of Christ, which we obtain apart from the use of the Lord's Supper. . . . It is certain, then, that he now speaks of the perpetual and ordinary manner of eating the flesh of Christ, which is done by faith only.' (30 3.)

20. These citations, then, from Calvin have nothing to do whatever with condemning the sacramental views of Zwingle, inasmuch as they refer to the participating of Christ's flesh apart from the sacrament. But Calvin after all did not very decidedly condemn Zwingle's verbal definition of eating the flesh of Christ, and probably from the fact that Augustine expressed the like sentiments of Zwingle. Calvin says, 'I do not absolutely disapprove of that mode of speaking. I only deny that it is a full interpretation, if they mean to define

what it is to eat the flesh of Christ. I see that Augustine 'repeatedly used this form of expression,' &c. (30 11.) How Zwingli himself spoke on this point may be seen, 29 6, 15, 28, 31-35.

21. There is one gross misconception on the part of the Bishop, and it is really an unpardonable one, viz., that the only way in which the flesh of Christ can be eaten and His blood drunk, is in the Eucharist. Finding then that Calvin and Zwingli differ from each other in their mode of speaking of the manner in which the flesh of Christ is eaten, the Bishop concludes that they both necessarily refer to a sacramental participation. Whereas they are really speaking of eating Christ's flesh as recorded in the sixth chapter of St John, and both of them deny, as did Cranmer also, (31 2, 3,) that our Lord referred to a sacramental or an oral eating. The Bishop too, could not but have known that Bishop Taylor, from whom he frequently quotes, held the same opinion. Usher and Waterland too are illustrious witnesses to the same effect, and both are also included in the Bishop's list of authorities on the Eucharist. (p. 709.) But he must have known that some divines denied that there was any allusion to a sacramental participation in the sixth of St John; for he says, 'A great many, both of Roman Catholic divines and of 'the mere figurists, have denied that the discourse in the 'sixth chapter of St John has any reference to the grace of the 'Eucharist. (p. 717.) A little further on he writes, now 'those who tell us that this had no reference to the Eucharist, 'say that nothing is here meant but that faith in the death 'of Christ is the great means of union to Christ, and that 'which raises us to life and immortality. But surely Calvin's 'belief, "that something more express and sublime is intended," (30, 9,) by such striking language, must commend itself to our reason.' (p. 719.) Though Calvin is really one of those whom the Bishop here designates as 'mere figurists,' yet he certainly did not deny, 'that the discourse in 'the sixth chapter of St John had any reference to the *grace* 'of the Eucharist.' The grace of the Eucharist is Christ Himself the Bread of life, His flesh or body and blood which He gave for the life of the world, and to this beyond all question

the discourse directly and immediately refers, and doubtless many of those whom the Bishop designates as mere figurists believe this. But many of these so called mere figurists with Zwingle, Calvin, Cranmer, Jewel, Usher, Waterland, and nearly all Protestant divines, do steadfastly and intelligently deny that in this discourse there is any reference to sacramental elements, or consecrated bread and wine. The natural inference from this is, that there must be some mode of eating the flesh of Christ other than sacramental, and Bishop Browne could scarcely have been ignorant of the fact, yet he practically ignores it, and consequently has egregiously misstated the teaching of Calvin, and, from the same cause, has founded a fallacious argument upon what he supposes to be the teaching of the Fathers in regard to a participation of Christ. He says, 'Thus much we premise as unquestionable. The whole 'primitive Church evidently believed in a *presence* of Christ 'in the Eucharist. All spoke of feeding there on Christ, eating His body and drinking His blood. . . . If there were no 'other alternative, but that the Fathers must have been either 'Papists or Zwinglians, must have held either a carnal presence, or none at all; then we must perforce acknowledge, 'that they believed in a carnal presence, and were transubstantialists. For some presence, they undoubtedly taught; 'some mode of feeding on Christ they undeniably believed in.' (p. 679.) The argument of the first part of this statement is to this effect. The whole primitive Church spoke of feeding in the Eucharist on Christ; eating His body and drinking His blood; therefore, the whole primitive Church evidently believed in a presence of Christ in the Eucharist, for they could not eat the body and blood of one who was absent. Here the Bishop is ignorant of the fact, or else he is ignoring it, that the whole primitive Church spoke of feeding on Christ; eating His body and drinking His blood, otherwise than in the Eucharist, through the medium of the spoken or written Word of God, and in the sacrament of Baptism. (See chapter vii. 44, 45.) We have only to conclude the argument and see whither it leads us. Therefore the whole primitive Church evidently believed in a *presence* in the written or spoken Word of God, and in the sacrament of Baptism, for they could not eat the body and blood of one who was absent.

The Bishop's argument, fairly stated, obliges him not to believe that the Fathers were all Papists, but that they were all Zwinglians: for, as he says, 'some presence they undoubtedly taught; some mode of feeding on Christ they undeniably believed in,' for they spoke of feeding on Him in His word, of eating His body or His flesh, in the Holy Scriptures; but as His body or flesh is not in the written or spoken signs of Holy Scripture, so no more need it be in order to be received in the sacramental signs, and no one pretends that it is in the sacramental sign of Baptism, though it is believed to be received therein. Moreover the Fathers commonly speak of the consecrated bread and wine as signs, figures, sacraments—'signs of sacred things,' symbols, types, figures, images, &c., (Ch. x. 49-53 above,) of that which they represent or signify, but we have no evidence that they believed that the consecrated elements thus variously called were really those very things of which they were the signs, figures, &c., and their own plain statements respecting the nature and use of such words forbid the very idea. (Ch. x. 59.) This is no other than the doctrine of Zwingle, and all the Reformers, excepting Luther and those who agreed with him. How plainly Hooker held this doctrine we have already seen. (Sec. 7 above.) According to this view of the sacramental signs, they hold the same rank, and have the same use, as the Word of God. How fully our own Reformers held this view is manifest from the fact that they expressed it in their Communion Office in the second exhortation as follows:—'Wherefore it is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that He hath given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, *as it is declared unto us, as well by God's word as by the holy sacraments* [sacred signs] *of His blessed body and blood.*' This Communion Office remained in use one hundred and ten years.

22. We shall now show that this was the common opinion alike of Zwingle, Calvin, Cranmer, and Jewel, that they taught that Christ's body or flesh could be eaten and His blood drunk in His word as well as in His sacraments; and that the mode of Christ's presence with believers whether in the Lord's Supper or apart from it, was the same.

23. Zwingle speaks of the word which is preached, and the symbol which is distributed by the command of God, as standing in the same relation to each other, and as alike assistances to faith. (29 25.) On the words, 'He that cometh to me,' Zwingle remarks, 'That is, who believes in me, who confides in me. Observe here, that to come to Christ, to believe in Christ, are esteemed the same thing. . . . He that believes in Christ, the same comes to Christ, the same eats Him, the same drinks Him, the same labours for the food which does not perish, the same works the work of God. (29 32.) How vividly Zwingle realised the blessings of the Lord's Supper and Christ's spiritual presence therein may be seen from what follows :—

'Thus in the Eucharist, when that Nobleman, taking His journey into a far country, distributing bread and wine, did far more lively and peculiarly give Himself unto us when He said, "This is my body," than if He had said "This is a token or sign of my body," although He took away His natural body and carried it into heaven. Yet nevertheless by these words in that appertaineth to faith and grace, He giveth Himself wholly, as if He had said, Now I go to die for you, and after a while will wholly depart from hence, &c. . . . ye may be no otherwise reminded of me, that is, that I delivered up myself for you, than if you should see me with your eyes face to face as ye now see me, both to eat with you, and by and by shall see me to be led from you to die for you.' (29 12.) 'We believe that Christ is truly in the Supper; yea, rather we do not believe that it is the Lord's Supper except Christ is present. This is confirmed. "Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." How much more is He present where the whole Church is congregated with Him.' (29 23.)

24. Calvin says, 'A sacrament is nothing else than a visible word or sculpture and image of that grace of God which the word more fully illustrates.' (30 1.) In his exposition of the sixth chapter of S. John, he says,

'For my part I am satisfied with the single word of Christ when He declares that *His flesh is true food*. This discourse does not relate to the Lord's Supper but to the uninterrupted communication of the flesh of Christ which we obtain apart from the use of the Lord's Supper. . . . It is certain, then, that He now speaks of the perpetual and ordinary manner of eating the flesh of Christ, which is done by faith only. And yet, at the same time, I acknowledge that there is nothing said here that is not figuratively represented, and actually bestowed on believers in the Lord's Supper.' (30 2, 3.) 'Wherefore

‘let it be a fixed point that the office of the sacraments differs not from ‘the word of God; and this is to hold forth and offer Christ to us.’ (30 7.) Again, ‘Christ adds that His flesh is meat indeed, and that ‘His blood is drink indeed [Calvin affirms that this discourse does not ‘relate to the Lord’s Supper]—by this food believers are reared to ‘eternal life.’ (30 13.) ‘For although sacraments signify nothing else ‘than what is announced to us by the word itself, yet it is a great ‘matter that there is submitted to our eye a kind of living images ‘which make a deeper impression on the senses.’ (30 24.) ‘Believers ‘before, and without the use of, the sacraments communicate with ‘Christ.’ (30 26.) ‘He alleges that I exhibit a Supper devoid of ‘Christ because I shut up Christ in heaven, just as Zwingle did, who ‘insisted that He was to be sought in heaven, and taught that He is ‘received into heaven until He shall appear in judgment. Our good ‘censor perceives not that the words he is lashing, as if they had proceeded from Zwingle, were uttered by the Apostle Peter. . . . But ‘Christ exhibits Himself in the word and sacraments. He must necessarily admit that the presence of Christ is manifested without the ‘use of the Supper as well as in the Supper. The promise of Christ ‘is, “I am with you always, even to the end of the world.” And ‘again, “Where two or three are met together in my name, there am ‘“I in the midst of them.” If we transfer the same thing to the ‘Supper, Westphal puts on his buskins, and getting into the heroics, ‘exclaims that credit is refused to the words of Christ.’ (30 32.)

Touching the nature of the sacraments, he says, ‘We are perfectly agreed that the sacraments are to be ranked in the ‘same place as the word, so while the Gospel is called the ‘power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, we ‘hesitate not to transfer the same title to the sacraments.’ (30 35.)

25. We come now to Cranmer, who, like Hooker, very distinctly denies that there is any presence or grace in the sacrament, and lest any word or phrase in his ‘Defence of the True ‘and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament’ should be misunderstood or misconstrued when he spoke of the presence of the body of Christ with those who worthily receive the sacrament, in his preface he speaks thus :—

‘Moreover, when I say and repeat many times in my book, that ‘the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the sacrament, lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean ‘that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, ‘yet He is corporally in the persons that duly receive them, this is to ‘advertise the reader, that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is, ‘that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ’s body that ‘was crucified for us, and of His blood that was shed for us, be really

‘and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments; but all this I understand of His spiritual presence, of the which he says, “I will be with you unto the world’s end,” and, “Whosoever two or three be gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,” and “He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.” For no more truly is He corporally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord’s Supper, than He is in the due ministration of Baptism.’ (31 1, 5.) ‘If Christ had never ordained His sacrament, yet should we have eaten His flesh and drunken His blood, and have thereby everlasting life, as all the faithful did before the sacrament was ordained, and do daily when they receive not the sacrament.’ (31 2.) ‘And although we do affirm (according to God’s word), that Christ is in all persons that truly believe in Him, in such sort, that with His flesh and blood He doth spiritually nourish and feed them, and giveth them everlasting life, and doth assure them thereof, as well by the promise of His word, as by the sacramental bread and wine in His Holy Supper, which He did institute for the same purpose.’ (31 4.) ‘I say Christ is spiritually and by grace in His Supper, as He is when two or three are gathered together in His name, meaning, that with both, He is spiritually, and with neither corporally; and yet I say not that there is no difference. For this difference there is, that with the one He is sacramentally, and with the other, not sacramentally, except they be gathered together in His name to receive the sacrament. Nevertheless, the self-same Christ is present in both, nourishing and feeding both, if the sacrament be rightly received.’ (31 6.)

26. Bishop Jewel states,

‘Here St Augustine saith, contrary to M. Harding’s doctrine, that we eat Christ’s body, not only in the sacrament, but also otherwise; yea, and so far he forceth this difference, that He maketh the eating of Christ’s body in the sacrament to be one thing, and the very true eating thereof indeed to be another thing. Again, touching the Fathers, &c.’ (32 5), ‘the difference herein is this, a sacrament is a figure token; the body of Christ is figured or tokened. The sacrament-bread is bread, it is not the body of Christ; the body of Christ is flesh. The bread is beneath, the body is above. The bread is on the table, the body is in heaven. The bread in the mouth, the body in the heart. The bread feedeth the outward man, the body feedeth the inward man; the bread feedeth the body, the body feedeth the soul; the bread will come to nothing, the body is immortal and shall not perish, &c., &c.’ (32 7.) ‘Moreover, we allow the sacraments of the Church, that is to say, certain holy signs and ceremonies, which Christ would we should use, that by them He might set before our eyes the mysteries of our salvation, and might more strongly confirm our faith which we have in His blood, and might seal His grace in our hearts. And those sacraments, together with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Hierome, Chrysostom, Basil, Dionysius, and other Catholic Fathers, do we call figures, signs, marks or badges,

‘prints, copies, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, patterns, representations, remembrances, and memories, and we make no doubt, together with the same doctors, to say, that these be certain *visible words*, ‘seals of righteousness, tokens of grace,’ &c. (32 8.) ‘For, although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast, and eat Him by faith, by understanding, and by the Spirit.’ (32 10.)

27. It is absolutely certain that there was no real difference between Zwingle and these other three younger Reformers, respecting the presence of Christ in the Lord’s Supper, as the above extracts demonstrate, as well as the much fuller statements given, 29 1-35, 30 1-35, 31 1-9, 32 1-11. In more modern times the opinion has been almost general, that Zwingle held different views, not only from Luther, but from almost all the Reformers. This is no excuse for Bishop Browne, he ought to have gone to the original sources of information, and to have examined and made himself well acquainted with the real facts of the case, and not to have yielded to a popular delusion, and intensify it by unfounded assumptions. He has most assiduously endeavoured to make it appear that the Church of England holds views touching the real presence not now held by any Protestant and Evangelical Church, and that these were the views of Calvin, Cranmer, and Jewel, and that all other Protestant and Evangelical Churches held for a long time past, and now hold the views of Zwingle. The one side holding a real spiritual presence of Christ in His Holy Supper, the other side denying ‘any special ‘presence altogether,’ or, ‘a presence of any sort’ therein. (pp. 677, 702.) The Bishop says, ‘The Calvinistic communions, including the English Puritans and Nonconformists, ‘have generally followed Zwinglius rather than Calvin in their ‘sacramental theory.’ (p. 596.) Again, ‘The Foreign Protestants, with the exception of the Lutherans, seem mostly ‘to adopt Zwinglian opinions, as have the generality of dissenters among ourselves. In the English Church those who ‘have formed their theological views for the most part on the ‘Puritan model, have taken in general low ground on the ‘sacraments.’ (p. 598.)

28. Bishop Browne, however, does not attempt to show that our Reformers differed directly from Zwingle, but rather that

they agreed with Calvin, and therefore disagreed with Zwingle. Thus he states, 'The Anglican Reformers have sometimes been 'charged with Zwinglian sentiments concerning the Eucharist. 'On this subject, however, it is capable of evident proof that 'they symbolized not with Zwinglius but with Calvin.' (p. 596). 'Both Cranmer and Ridley, to whom we are chiefly indebted 'for our formularies, maintained a doctrine nearly identical 'with that maintained by Calvin.' (p. 705). After citing Jewel, which citation we have given **32 9**, the Bishop remarks, 'It appears, then, that our Reformers symbolized herein with 'Calvin.' (p. 708). But Jewel herein also symbolised with Zwingle, for the very passage which the Bishop has cited from Jewel forms part of the confession of faith of the Church of England (as we have shown **32 10**), which, with eleven other confessions, including that of the Zwinglians, from as many Protestant churches, form one accordant faith called 'The 'Harmony of Protestant Confessions.' If plain statements and simple affirmations can convey truth, then most certainly Calvin did not differ from Zwingle concerning the presence in the Lord's Supper.

29. Some of the statements of Calvin in regard to the Lord's Supper have been supposed to be subversive of the sentiments of Zwingle, and Bishop Browne has culled some of them from his writings, which with other citations are given **30 4, 5, 9, 16, 19, 21**. The candid reader, in endeavouring to ascertain the proper meaning of several of these citations, will of course allow Calvin to be the interpreter of his own language. Cranmer and Jewel have been cited after the same fashion and for the same purpose. These are given **31 9, 32 9**.

30. Calvin, then, did not differ but agreed with Zwingle, and as the Bishop correctly states that our Reformers agreed with Calvin, therefore they agreed with Zwingle, and as the Bishop also instructs us that all other Protestant and Christian Churches agree with Zwingle, so, as is meet and right, the English Church agrees with all other Protestant and Christian Churches in the belief of a real absence of any real presence whatever in the consecrated elements, and a real spiritual presence of Christ with all the faithful in His Holy Supper.

31. We have yet to examine another false accuser of Zwingle,

and a virulent one too, who is all the more important from the fact that his unfair statements and misconceptions, or something worse, form part of the 'Judgment delivered by the Right Hon. Sir Robert Phillimore, in the case of the Office of the Judge promoted by Sheppard v. Bennett.' In our answer to some of the main points of this judgment we have already examined two of the most important witnesses, Bertram and Ælfrie, by whom the Dean of Arches would seem to vindicate the doctrine of the real presence as held by Mr Bennett (Ch. ix. 57-70.) We have now to examine the testimony of two living witnesses, as cited in the same judgment. These are Canon Liddon and Bishop Moberley, men of high standing, and both Bampton lecturers, and from their lectures it is that their testimony is adduced.

32. The Dean of Arches introduces the testimony of Canon Liddon as follows :—

'The doctrine in these Formularies excludes the Zwinglian account of the sacraments. On this point I will cite the opinion of Dr Liddon, Professor of the Exegesis of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford, and Canon of St Paul's :—"As our Lord's divinity is the truth which illuminates and sustains the world—redeeming virtue of His death, so in like manner it explains and justifies the power of the Christian sacraments as actual channels of supernatural grace. To those who deny that Jesus Christ is God, the sacraments are naturally nothing more than *badges or tokens* of social co-operation [Art. xxv. condemns this Zwinglian account of sacraments generally.] The one sacrament is only a *sign of profession* and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened. [Art. xxvii. condemns this Zwinglian account of Baptism.] The other is at best only a *sign of the love* that Christians ought to have one towards another. [Art. xxviii. condemns this Zwinglian account of the Holy Communion.] Thus sacraments are viewed as altogether human acts ; God gives nothing in them, He has no special relation to them. They are regarded as purely external ceremonies which may possibly suggest certain moral ideas by recalling the memory of a Teacher who died many centuries ago. They help to save His name from dying out among men. Thus they discharge the functions of a public monument, or of a ribbon or medal implying membership in an association, or of an anniversary festival, implying membership in an association, or of an anniversary festival instituted to celebrate the name of some departed historical worthy. It cannot be said that in point of effective moral power they rise to the level of a good statue or portrait, since a merely outward ceremonial cannot recall character

“and suggest moral sympathy as effectively as an accurate rendering
 “of the human sympathy, as effectively as an accurate rendering of
 “the human countenance in stone, or colour, or the lines of an
 “engraving. Rites, with a function so purely historical, are not
 “likely to survive any serious changes in human feelings and associa-
 “tions. Men gradually determine to commemorate the object of
 “their regard in some other way, which may perhaps be more in
 “harmony with their personal tastes; they do not admit that this
 “particular form of commemoration, although enjoined by the Author
 “of Christianity, binds their consciences with the force of any moral
 “obligation, they end by deciding that it is just as well to neglect
 “such a commemoration altogether. If the Socinian and Zwinglian
 “estimate of the sacraments had been that of the Church of Christ,
 “the sacraments would long ago have been abandoned as useless
 “ceremonies. But the Church has always seen in them, not mere
 “outward signs addressed to the taste or to the imagination, nor even
 “signs (as Calvinism asserts,) which are tokens of grace received
 “independently of them. [See Cartwright, quoted by Hooker, Eccl.
 “Pol. v. 60, 3, note. He who is not a Christian before he comes to
 “receive Baptism, cannot be made a Christian by Baptism; which is
 “only the seal of the grace of God before received] but signs which
 “through the power of the promise and words of Christ, effect what
 “they signify. They are *effectual signs of grace*, and *God's goodwill*
 “*towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us.* That
 “depreciation of the sacraments has led with general consistency to
 “depreciation of our Lord's Eternal Person is a simple matter of
 “history. True, there have been and are believers in our Lord's
 “Divinity who deny the realities of sacramental grace. But ex-
 “perience appears to show that their position is only a transitional
 “one. For history illustrates this law of fatal declension even in
 “cases where sacramental belief, although imperfect, has been far
 “nearer to the truth than in the naturalism of Zwingli. [Zwingli de
 “Vera et Falsa Relig. Op. iii., p. 263. n. A. ‘Est ergo,’ &c. (See
 “29 4, for the passage.) ‘Here God does and gives nothing; the
 “ceremony described is not a ‘means of grace’ but only and simply
 “an act of man, a human ceremonial action, expressive of certain
 “ideas and convictions, shared by those who take part in it. It is
 “substantially the same account as that which is given in the formal
 “documents of early Socinianism. It would be an extreme injustice
 “to Calvin to identify his belief on the subject with these unspirit-
 “ual errors. Calvin even says, ‘Quicquid ad exprimendam,’ &c.
 “(For the passage see 31 15.)] Many of the most considerable
 “Socinian congregations in England were founded by the Presby-
 “terians who fell away from the Church in the seventeenth century.
 “The pulpit and the chair of Calvin are now filled by men who
 “have, alas! much more in common with the Racovian Catechism
 “than with the positive element of the theology of ‘The Institutes.’
 “The restless mind of man cannot but at last push its principle to

“the real limit of its application, even although centuries should intervene between the premiss and the conclusion. Imagine that the sacraments are only picturesque memorials of an absent Christ, and the mind is in a fair way that the Christ who is thus commemorated as absent by a barren ceremony, is Himself only and purely human.” (Liddon’s Bampton Lectures, 1866, lec. viii. p. 719.) I hold it to have been the intention of the Formularies to exclude the Zwinglian doctrine of bare commemoration with respect to the Lord’s Supper, although that error be not expressly mentioned.’ (*Judgment, &c.*, pp. 28-30.)

33. If Sir Robert Phillimore did not know what the real views of Zwingle were, it may be regretted that he should have been so imposed upon by this eloquent Bampton lecturer. The attack on Zwingle was bad enough, as perpetrated by Dr Wiseman, but this is really outrageous, for not only are his sacramental views entirely misrepresented, but he is classed with Socinians, as if he intended to dishonour his Saviour. Nor is this the worst part of this eloquent declamation, for in it Canon Liddon assumes that the ancient Church taught, and that the Church of England now teaches, his doctrine of the real presence, which is substantially that of the heretic Paschasius. Canon Liddon, with twenty others of the same school, made a confession of their faith in regard to the Eucharist to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which is recorded what here follows :—‘We believe that in the holy Eucharist, by virtue of the consecration through the power of the Holy Ghost, the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, “the inward part, or thing signified,” are present, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, under “the outward visible part or sign,” or “form of bread and wine.” . . . We believe that Christ Himself, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, ‘present in the sacrament’ [that is, as explained above, ‘Christ is present, really and truly . . . “under the outward visible “part or sign,” or “form of bread and wine”’] ‘is therein to be adored.’ These twenty-one ministers of the Church of England perform very much the same part in it as the twenty-five men performed in the Jewish city, of which we read in Ezekiel xi. 1, 2. As a specimen we here append a few of the names of these ministers : G. A. Denison, Vicar of East Brent, Archdeacon of Taunton ; H. P. Liddon, Prebendary of Salis-

bury ; R. T. Littledale, LL.D., D.C.L., Priest of the Diocese of London ; A. H. Mackonochie, Perpetual Curate of St Alban's, Holborn ; E. B. Pusey, Professor of Hebrew, Canon of Christ-church, &c., &c.

34. We have seen what the faith of Canon Liddon and his twenty brethren is, and, probably because Zwingle denied that there was any presence in the consecrated elements, as did all the Reformers except the Lutherans, as also did Hooker himself, he indulges in a set of false assumptions, and abuses his eloquence in magnifying them. But this is quite in keeping with the school of Paschasius, and the language in which Jewel rebuked an earlier disciple of it is just as applicable to a later one, when he says, 'And whereas M. Harding thus unjustly 'reporteth of us that we maintain a naked figure, and a bare 'sign or token only, and nothing else ; if he be of God he 'knoweth well he should not thus bestow his tongue or hand 'to bear false witness. It is written : " God will destroy them " "all that speak untruth." He knoweth well we feed not the 'people of God with bare signs and figures, but teach them the sacraments of Christ be holy mysteries, and that in the ministration thereof Christ is set before us even as He was crucified 'on the cross,' &c. (32 3.)

35. But the crowning piece of false accusation against Zwingle is, that he simply believed those very things and no more than they did, whom, as Canon Liddon makes it appear, the 25th, 27th, and 28th Articles condemn, and in so doing has seriously misguided the Dean of Arches and all who may accept the accusation as true. The fact is, that these three Articles substantially and almost verbally express the very same things as those Articles which relate to the same points in the Zwinglian Confession, as may be seen from what here follows :—

'Article 20. Of the force and efficacy of the Sacraments.—The 'signs which, in the Church of Christ be called sacraments are two, 'Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These, being tokens of secret 'things, do not consist of bare signs, but of signs and things also. For 'in Baptism water is the sign, and the thing itself is regeneration, and 'adoption among the people of God. In the Lord's Supper bread and 'wine be the signs, but the thing is the communication of the body of 'Christ ; salvation purchased for us, and the remission of sins. These 'things are received by faith, as the signs be received with the cor-

‘poral mouth ; and the whole fruit of the sacraments is in the thing itself. Whereupon we affirm that sacraments are not only tokens of human fellowship, but also pledges of the grace of God.’—(*Harmony of Protestant Confessions*, p. 287.)

For more upon this point see chapter x. 22-24.

36. In a book entitled *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England, an exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, by Thomas Rogers, A.M., Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, 1607, we find the very same Articles which Canon Liddon employs to condemn Zwinglianism illustrated and confirmed by references to suitable parts of the Zwinglian Confession, and the above extract is a fair specimen of the parts referred to. Thus Rogers divides the 25th Article, which Canon Liddon adduces as condemnatory of the doctrine of Zwingle, so far as it relates to the two sacraments, into four propositions, and affirms of each as follows :—‘This do the godly in all their churches, and throughout the world, both teach and testify.’ (p. 245). ‘This truth do the purer churches of these days everywhere acknowledge.’ (p. 247). ‘This same is affirmed by the Reformed Churches.’ (p. 248). ‘This is the judgment of the Churches Protestant.’ (p. 251). The 27th and 28th Articles he treats after the same manner, and in proof of the truth of the propositions which he affirms of the Articles he invariably adduces the testimony of the Zwinglian Confession first.

37. Canon Liddon, however, cites a passage direct from Zwingle’s writings. This is given 29 4, excepting the part in italics, which he did not cite. On the sentence he remarks, ‘Here God does, and gives, nothing ; the ceremony described is not a “means of grace,” but only and simply an act of man, a human ceremonial action, expressive of certain ideas and convictions shared by those who take part in it. It is substantially the same account as that which is given in the formal documents of early Socinianism. It would be an extreme injustice to Calvin to identify his belief on the subject with these unspiritual errors. Calvin even says, “Quicquid “ad,” &c. For the passage, as translated, see 30 15. This declamation just as much applies to the language of St Paul as to that of Zwingle, who bases what he says on the apostle’s words. Did Canon Liddon omit to cite this part that he

might make his castigation of Zwingle more complete and telling by not including St Paul with him? The apostle says, 'For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are 'all partakers of that one bread' (1 Cor. x. 17). Zwingle says, 'Being about to commemorate the Lord's Supper, that is, 'to show it forth, testify by the deed itself that they are 'members of that one body, that they are that one bread; 'for all who believe in Christ are one body, as not in one 'place only doth Paul testify, but especially above in the tenth 'chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians (29 4). Against these sentiments Canon Liddon declaims in the following style:—'It would be an extreme injustice to Calvin to identify 'his belief on the subject with these unspiritual errors.' (p. 283). We may be certain that Calvin would wish to agree with St Paul, and we may take that point for granted, but he plainly tells us, or what is equivalent thereto, that he agreed with what Canon Liddon is pleased to call the unspiritual errors of Zwingle. For he says, 'This good zealot saw clearly that all 'whom he styles sacramentarians, have one same faith, and 'confess it as with one same mouth, and even if the two excellent doctors, Zwinglius and Ecolampadius, who were known 'to be faithful servants of Jesus Christ, were still alive, they 'would not change one word in our doctrine' (30 22). For other instances see 30 32, 33.

38. St Paul and his devout disciple Zwingle, were not giving an account of the Lord's Supper in all its aspects, but in one aspect only, namely, as a representation of our union with Christ and with one another, and the realization of this to our own consciousness, according to Christ's appointment. Could Canon Liddon be unacquainted with the fact that if Zwingle erred in dwelling more especially upon this union he erred with all the leading Fathers, and especially Augustine and Chrysostom? We forbear citing any of them again, but refer to chapter xi. 80-103. Canon Liddon, in abusing his cultivated utterance in condemning the sentiments of Zwingle, as expressed in the passage in question, has by implication equally condemned Bishop Jewel, one of the greatest divines of our Reformed Church. He, in defending his learned friend, Calvin, from the attack of a Papist, by way of showing what

exalted views Calvin had of the blessings of the Eucharist, cited from him a passage containing identically the same sentiments as those contained in the passage which Canon Liddon cited from Zwingle, and which he so severely reprobated (see 32 11, and also secs. 1 and 2).

39. This is the place to notice a charge which Bishop Browne has made against Zwingle. 'He denies that there can be any spiritual body of Christ except His Church' (p. 702). In proof of this statement we are referred to a part of Zwingle's writings which is given 29 6. But on consulting the passage it will be seen that the Bishop only states half the truth, which is really deceptive. Zwingle asks, 'Is there found anywhere in the Scriptures any other spiritual body than either the Church, as contained in Eph. iv. and Colos. i., or our faith, which also believes that He on the cross paid the penalties for us, and by Him is certain of salvation?' (29 6). This, although stated interrogatively, is intended to be affirmative. Could the Bishop inform us, on the authority of Holy Scripture, what other body can be present in the Lord's Supper? This Holy Ordinance in the New Testament is presented under two different aspects. We have, first, its institution, as recorded by three Evangelists and St Paul, in which more especially is set forth the death of Christ for us and our saving interest therein; and, secondly, we have a reference to it by the Apostle Paul, for the purpose of teaching the nature of the union of Christ with all that are His, and their union with one another. Doubtless this is a spiritual body—spiritual, too, in the proper sense of the word, both as used in Scripture and commonly by the Fathers. Now we have no right to interpret the other accounts of the Lord's Supper so as not to be in perfect harmony with this. Is the apostle, in his statement respecting the Lord's Supper, as recorded in 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, and xi. 23-26, speaking of two essentially different bodies, or of one and the same body under two different aspects? According to the teaching of all antiquity it is of the latter and not of the former he is speaking. Zwingle, then, in accordance with all antiquity, speaks of Christ's spiritual body, of which the Church participates, as being either the Church as described in Eph. iv. and Colos. i., or our faith which also

believes that He on the cross paid the penalties for us, and by Him is certain of salvation. (29 6.) This mode of speech is somewhat peculiar, but Zwingle knew well enough what he was writing about. We probably shall get at the truth by giving a correct answer to the question, What flesh or body did Christ require to be eaten in order to the possession of spiritual and ultimately of eternal life? Chrysostom states, 'Christ calleth Himself "the bread of life," because He maintaineth our life which is to be, and saith, "Whosoever shall "eat of this bread shall live for ever." By "bread" He meaneth here either His saving doctrines and the faith which 'is in him or His own body, for both nerve the soul' (22 13). How Zwingle speaks upon this point may be seen 29 3. Chrysostom, however, different from other Fathers, especially Origen and Basil, considers that Christ, in this discourse, is speaking of participating of His flesh or body in the sacrament of the Supper. Still it did not appear incongruous to him for Christ to represent 'His saving doctrines and the faith which 'was in Him' as bread, flesh, or body. But this is exactly how Augustine understood the eating of Christ's flesh or body. He shows that to understand our Lord's words literally, as these disciples of Paschasius do, would be to regard Him as commanding a disgraceful thing or a crime, and therefore He is to be understood as 'commanding us to communicate in the 'passion of the Lord, and sweetly and profitably to treasure 'up in our memory, that His flesh was crucified and wounded 'for us.' (21 13.) This is exactly what Tertullian taught 200 years earlier. (10 6.) Eusebius states, 'But understand 'well, that the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and 'life, so that His words and discourses are the flesh and blood 'of which he who always partakes, as one fed upon heavenly 'food shall be a partaker of heavenly life.' (14 6.) Basil states, 'Christ called His whole mystical course and conversation on earth His flesh and blood, and signified by them that 'doctrine, consisting of practical, and natural, and theological 'teaching.' (16 9.) But this mode of participating of Christ's body being by faith only, in no way differs from the participation of the same body in the sacrament of the Supper, according to the teaching of the Fathers. Origen states,

'We are said to drink the blood of Christ, not only in the way of Sacraments, but also when we receive His words, in which is life, as also Himself saith, "The words which I speak "unto you, they are spirit and they are life."' (11 34.) Jerome also says, 'We have only one good to feed on His flesh and to drink His blood, not only in the mystery, [that is, in the Eucharist], but also in the reading of the Scriptures.' (18 49.) And he yet further says, 'If when we hear the Word of God, the Word of God and the flesh of Christ and His blood are poured into our ears,' &c. (18 51.) Gaudentius in a special discourse to Neophytes on the Lord's Supper plainly regarded eating the Lord's body as equivalent to believing in Him. He explains eating the body of the paschal lamb in relation to Christ as accepting and believing the entire body of the Scriptures. (19 5.) And speaking more especially of eating Christ's body in the Eucharist, he asserts, 'For what we have above explained generally, as to eating the flesh of the Lamb, we must observe, in tasting these same mysteries of the Lord's passion.' (19 8.) And then he goes on to remark, 'We are bidden to eat, in the mysteries, the Head of His Divinity, together with the feet of His incarnation, and the inward parts, that we may believe all things alike,' &c. (19 9.)

40. Now comes the question if the spiritual body in the Eucharist is the Church of Christ, how can the faithful in participating of that body at the same time participate of the body which was given for us? What then, is it asked, did the church die? Was it buried, and did it rise again? Cyril has so well answered this question, that we refer to him. (15 9, 10.) Chrysostom says plainly that there is no difference between Christ's body, the church, and that which was crucified. (22 29.) Jerome plainly conceives of the body of Christ after the same manner. (18 63.) How the Fathers generally teach on this point is more especially noticed in chapter xi. 80-103.

41. This, then, is that spiritual body in its two different aspects, of which Zwingli speaks, and the believer's union with, or incorporation into this body, is a fact which he believes to be more especially realized by the devout communicant in the

Lord's Supper. It is very suitable for the devout reader here to pause a moment and reflect on what, to him as a sincere believer in Christ, must be of infinite moment, viz., his union with Him and eternal interest in all that He, the Head of that body, of which he is a member, has done and promised to do for it. It is being one with Christ, and Christ one with him, being in Christ and Christ in him, on which depends the believer's eternal interests. By virtue of this union is realized now in faith, and especially as faith is aided and exercised in the divinely appointed use of the Lord's Supper, both what the believer has become, and by anticipation, what he ultimately will be. Taking God's Holy Word as our guide, could there be anything more absorbing and profoundly important to the higher nature of man? It is to this that Zwingle alludes when he says, 'They who are about to commemorate the Lord's death, that is, to show it forth, testify by the deed itself that they are members of that one body, that they are that one bread, for all who believe in Christ are one body, as not in one place only doth Paul testify.' (29 4.) Of this it is that Canon Liddon affirms, 'Here God does and gives nothing. The ceremony described is not a "means of grace," but only and simply an act of man, a human ceremonial action, expressive of certain ideas and convictions, shared by those who take part in it. It is substantially the same account as that which is given in the formal documents of early Socinianism.' (p. 483.) This zealous disciple of Paschasius must have known his own faith far better than he did that of Zwingle, and this may account for the violent attack which here and elsewhere he has made upon him. It is true that what St Paul and his follower Zwingle realized in the Lord's Supper, and what they taught others to realize, was purely spiritual, and yet in truth more real and enduring than the material universe. Of course in neither of these aspects of Christ's spiritual body could it be received by those organs of the human body which our divine benefactor has bestowed upon us wherewith to sustain and replenish our material sensuous nature. But all the disciples of Paschasius contend that the only real participation of the body of which they con-

ceive can be received after that fashion, and that when the sacramental elements are duly consecrated by one who has been invested with the priesthood lineally descended from Christ through His apostles and their successors then they are made to contain, or become the vehicle of Christ's body to all who receive them. That we may not even seem to misrepresent Canon Liddon, his own chosen sentiments on the point here follow; 'The essential difference [between Prayer and Sacraments] consists in this: the sacred tokens of the New Covenant contain an *actual communication* of the Being and Life of the risen Christ, who is the Redeemer and Perfecter, not only of man's spiritual, but of man's corporeal nature. In Prayer there is only a *unio mystica*, a real, yet only spiritual, psychological union; but in the sacraments the deepest mystery rests in the truth, that in them Christ communicates Himself, and not only spiritually, but in His glorified corporeity.' For this dignified piece of superstition as far as it relates to sacramental participation, we are directed to see '*Martensen, Christ. Dogm.*, p. 418, *Clark's Transl.*' (pp. 480, 481.)

42. Canon Liddon in recording these sentiments, with approval has expressed his belief of the corporal presence of Christ's glorified body in the sacramental elements. It is then from this Paschasian point of view that he and all of his school judge those to be heretics who deny that there is any presence in the elements. Strange as it may seem, Bishop Browne too appears to teach that the glorified body of Christ is present in the Eucharist and therein received. He says,

'Christ's body is glorified, but still it is the same body, though in its glorified condition. It is not even denied that we receive that body really, substantially, corporally; for although the word "*corporally*" seems opposed to "*spiritually*," yet it is not so of necessity. And, as we acknowledge that it is a body which we receive, so we cannot deny its presence corporally, *i.e.*, after the manner of a body. Only, when we come to explain ourselves, we say, that, though it be Christ's very body we receive in the Eucharist, and though we cannot deny even the word *corporal* concerning it, yet as Christ's body is now a spiritual body, so we expect a spiritual presence of that body; and we do not believe that we *naturally* and *carnally* eat that which is now no longer carnal and natural, but that we

‘spiritually receive Christ’s spiritual body into our souls, and spiritually ‘drink His life-giving blood with the lips of our spirit.’

After this we are told to ‘See this excellently laid down by ‘Bp. Taylor, *On the Real Presence*, sect. i., 9-11.’ (p. 680.) It were strange indeed if such a brilliant, illustrious, and accurate divine as Bishop Jeremy Taylor could, after the manner of a Valentinian or Marcionite heretic, deprive our blessed Lord of His humanity, which is now glorified, and represent it as being present everywhere, after the manner of the Holy Ghost. Assuredly Taylor teaches no such doctrine.

43. Both Canon Liddon and Bishop Browne, in bringing the body or human nature of Christ from heaven previous to His second coming, are entertaining a private opinion contrary to the unanimous consent of the Catholic Church. It is not impossible, however, that Canon Liddon may have recanted this part of his heresy, for, since the publication of his Bampton Lectures, he, with twenty others to whom we have alluded above (sec. 33), have confessed as follows, (1) ‘We repudiate ‘the opinion of a “corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh ‘“and blood;” that is to say, of the presence of His body ‘and blood, as they “are in heaven.”’ Let the reader consider well this leading article of Canon Liddon’s sacramental faith, and compare and contrast with it this other article of his belief, viz., ‘In the sacraments the deepest mystery rests in ‘the truth that in them Christ communicates Himself, not ‘only spiritually, but in His glorified corporeity.’ (p. 481.)

44. The strange opinion entertained by Bishop Browne, that Christ’s body, since its glorification, can be present after the manner of the Holy Ghost, has no foundation whatever in Scripture, as we have already shown in chapter v. 9 above; what the leading Fathers have taught respecting Christ having a spiritual body may be seen in chapter ix. 44-51; and to bring Christ’s human nature from heaven previously to His second coming, whether on the theory of Canon Liddon or Bishop Browne, is plainly contrary to the distinct teaching of the Fathers, as has been shown in chapter ix., 71-81.

45. It has recently been decided by the highest court of appeal in the Church of England, that the Roman custom of standing before the communion table with the face toward it,

and the back to the people, when making the consecration prayer, is contrary to the law of the Church. Canon Liddon has given notice to his Bishop that he intends to disobey the law. We cannot perhaps better serve the cause of truth, and carry out the purpose and intention of this work, than by viewing Canon Liddon's adoration and attitude in the light of the early Catholic Church. The attitude in its earliest origin dates from the second century, when it was general, if not universal. The early Fathers were often misguided by an imperfect version of the Scriptures. In the original Hebrew Scriptures, and in our version of them, where the word Branch occurs, or its equivalent, as a title of the Messiah, in the early versions, there is the word 'East,' and hence, in the three following passages, Jer. xxiii. 5, Zec. iii. 8, and vi. 12, that was understood to be a Scripture title of Christ which doubtless is a mistake, and from this mistake originated the practice of praying with the face toward the east. Tertullian and Origen allude to this practice, and so does Basil, and he asks, 'What writing hath taught us to pray turned to the east?' (16 7) plainly implying that the practice was not founded on the teaching of Holy Scripture. But here it is most important to bear in mind that the early churches of antiquity, of which we have any account, were all built after the model of the Jewish Temple, with the entrance at the east, exactly the reverse of churches in general of the present day. We learn this from Eusebius, who describes the magnificent churches built at Tyre and Jerusalem, both of which were entered at the east. A ground plan of the church, built at Jerusalem, is given in a preface to a translation of Catechetical Lectures of Cyril, bishop of that church, as edited by Pusey, Keble, and J. H. Newman. This church, the great wonder of the fourth century, was built exactly the reverse of modern churches. In all acts of prayer, whether in the communion service or more general worship, the bishop or presbyter would have his face to the east, and, of course, his face to the people, as they were eastward of him; and instead of standing before the table, he would stand behind it, that is, the table would come between him and the communicants, or congregation. But, for some reason or other, churches sometime about the

sixth century were built just the reverse of the earlier churches, and stood due east, instead of due west. Accepting as evidence the testimony of Durandus, a Roman Ritualist, who lived about the twelfth century, we learn that

'The priest at the altar and in divine services ought, from the institution of Pope Vigilius, to pray toward the east. Whence, in churches having their door from the west, celebrating the mass, in salutation he turns himself to the people, for those whom we salute we stand before face to face. Accordingly, in the fourth part, concerning salutation it is said, and then being about to pray, he turns himself to the east. But in churches having their doors from the east, as at Rome, turning in salutation is not necessary, the priest celebrating in them always stands turned to the people. The temple of Solomon and the tabernacle of Moses are described as having their doors from the east Ex. xxxiii. We then pray towards the east, because he who is the splendour of the eternal light has illuminated those sitting in darkness, since "the East from on high hath visited us," of whom it is read, "Behold the man whose name is the East." (Zec. vi. 12.) *Rationale Divinorum officiorum*, lib. v, cap. ii., ff. 221, 222.

46. From this witness, who lived about the twelfth century, and when the doctrine of the real presence was held in its grossest form, we learn that the attitude of the priest had then nothing whatever to do with the consecrated elements, but simply was regulated by that unknown and merely imaginary part of the heavens called the east. We naturally ask, on what grounds does Canon Liddon consider himself bound to disregard the law of His Church, and publicly proclaim his intention to violate it? Is it the ancient but semi-heathen practice of worshipping due east? He does not pretend to allege any such reason, but persists in his attitude, on the ground that it is 'in conformity to the practice of the primitive Church of Christ,' and 'would seem to be practically of the greatest importance: it is, by wide-spread consent in the popular apprehension, closely connected with the maintenance of Eucharistic truth,' and connects the 'particular posture of a Christian minister with the representative character of his ministerial work.' (*The Purchas Judgment, a Letter of Acknowledgment to the Right Hon. Sir J. T. Coleridge, &c.*, pp. 16, 17.) It will now be shown that the position in regard to the act of consecration is not in conformity to the practice of the primitive Church of Christ, but contrary thereto, and so far

from being closely connected with the maintenance of Eucharistic truth, it is closely connected with Eucharistic falsehood, and rather gives the character to the Lord's Supper of a heathen feast than a Christian spiritual festival; and also that the particular posture of the minister does not represent, but entirely misrepresents, the character of his ministerial work. We have shown that the posture in its ancient and catholic usage had relation only to praying toward the east, because Christ in some way or other was ignorantly supposed to have regard to that imaginary quarter of the heavens; but in more modern times, subsequent to the twelfth century, the posture had relation only to the communion table when whole Christ God and Man was supposed about to be brought down, or actually brought down upon it. In a supplement to Nelson's 'Fasts and Festivals,' we are very correctly told, 'When superstition and idolatry had overrun the Christian Church and the doctrine of transubstantiation, with the practice of adoring and paying divine homage to the elements of bread and wine came in fashion, this custom was continued (of worshipping towards the east) upon a different account. All the old reasons were forgotten or laid aside, and the altars being built, and the elevation of the host being made towards the east, people were taught to bow themselves that way out of reverence to God, who they were made to believe was present to their view in that quarter.'

47. It is painful in the extreme for a minister of the Protestant and Evangelical Church of England to proclaim his intention to set its laws at defiance in order to persist in a practice which had its origin in gross superstition and idolatry some time subsequent to the twelfth century. The old superstition of turning to the east to pray was bad enough, but this comparatively new superstition is a thousand times worse. We shall now show that that particular posture of the minister in presiding at the Lord's table so strenuously maintained by Canon Liddon, does not, as he thinks, represent, but entirely misrepresents, his ministerial work. This will be seen best in the light of an ancient celebration. And who so likely for a celebrant as the great Catholic Father Augustine. We find him addressing the newly baptised thus: 'You have, as it

‘ were, come to the cup of the Lord, and there ye are on the ‘ table, and there ye are in the cup.’ (24 28.) In another discourse he addressed them thus : ‘ Be what ye see, and take ‘ what ye are.’ (21 136.) It is needless to say that the communicants were not really on the table or in the cup, nor could they really be what they saw, or take what they were. But Augustine shall be his own interpreter, ‘ If then you wish ‘ to understand the body of Christ, hear the apostle saying to ‘ the faithful, “ Ye are the body of Christ and His members.” ‘ If then ye are the body of Christ and His members, the ‘ mystery of yourselves is placed upon the Lord’s Table.’ (21 136.) Plainly then as the body of Christ, they were not really on the table nor really in the cup, but only in mystery—mystically, or in sacrament—sacramentally. The mystery was on the table, but that of which it was a mystery was standing near, the sacrament or sign of a sacred thing was on the table, the sacred thing or reality was close by. Now we ask, looking at the leading design of the Lord’s Supper as viewed according to the teaching of Augustine, who is almost universally reputed to be the middle and both ends of all human authority in the Christian Church, what as regards the posture of the minister who presides could be a more complete violation of the apostolic rule, ‘ Let all things be done ‘ decently and in order,’ than for the minister to face the mystery, and turn his back upon that of which it was a mystery ; or so to stand as to have the sacrament, or sign of a sacred thing before him, and the sacred thing itself, or reality behind him ? The posture contended for is most unsuitable on other grounds as representing an essential distinction between him who presides and his fellow-communicants. Now, according to the most certain teaching of all antiquity, he is no more a priest than any one of his fellow-Christians is who has been baptised, whether man or woman, as has been shown partly in this work, but more especially in the book entitled ‘ Whose ‘ Are The Fathers ?’ But it is said that he has derived a special power by a lineal descent from the apostles to do, or as they will have it, to sacrifice, a remembrance, inasmuch as when Christ said to His disciples, ‘ Do this in remembrance of me,’ he thereby constituted them sacrificing priests, and invested

them with power to convey by ordination the same priesthood to others. According to the plain teaching of the Fathers, as we have shown in chapter vi. 9-18, it was alike the right and duty of every member of the Church to do a remembrance, however we may explain the phrase. Our Lord did the passover *with* His disciples just as a master did it with the members of his household. He did not do it *for* them, but *with* them, and they *with* Him. In like manner in the Christian Passover, the presbyter, or one who presides, does not do a remembrance *for* his fellow Christians, but *with* them, and they *with* him, and we have shown that so teaches all antiquity.

48. Canon Liddon in his Bampton Lectures appears to assign an office to the sacraments which exclusively belongs to the Holy Ghost. This seems to follow from the fact that he believes in the divinity and personality of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We have seen how with twenty other men he has made a formal confession of his offering to it the highest form of worship, and doubtless he would not thus offer it unless he believed it to be supremely divine. That there may be no mistake in what light the sacrament is regarded by himself and his school, one of the most distinguished members of that school shall give his own account of it :—'If we may reverently say it (using an illustration which is applied by the Church to a subject, if possible, still more awful than this,) "as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man," and as "God "and man is one Christ," so the consecrated bread and wine and the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are one sacrament. And as we know the soul of man, which we cannot see, to be present by the presence of his living body, which we can see, so the presence of that bread and wine is to us a sure token of the presence of Christ's body and blood. We are not more certain of the one by our reliance on God's ordinary providence, than we are of the other by our faith in Christ's own word.' (*Keble on Eucharistical Adoration*, ii., 36, pp. 64, 65.)

49. Now if Canon Liddon instead of abusing his eloquence in misrepresenting the real sacramental teaching of Zwingli, associating him with Socinians, and making it appear that his

views led to Socinianism, had legitimately used it in showing how much the true Christian Church is indebted to Zwingli and other Reformers in casting off the doctrine of the real presence as held by Paschasius and his disciples, with all its gross idolatrous practices, he would have acted as a true son of the Church to which he professedly belongs. It should be borne in mind that if we are to know what are the fruits of Canon Liddon's sacramental faith, we must go to the systems of superstition called the Latin and Greek Churches, which substantially hold it. Not a single reformed church, nor even a Reformer of the sixteenth century believed as Canon Liddon and his school believe, in regard to the sacraments. Luther believed that the body and blood of Christ were really in or with the consecrated elements, but he assigned no other use and office to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper than those assigned to it by Zwingli and the other Reformers. Dr Pusey fairly states Luther's sentiments as follows :—

‘The weak point in the Lutheran system is, that the only office assigned to the sacrament is to kindle faith; so that according to them, if this language was pressed, God did not “work invisibly in “us through the sacrament,” but rather on occasion of the sacrament kindled faith, of which faith grace was the reward. According to the most natural interpretation of their words, they believed, not that God gave to faith through the sacrament the gifts peculiar to the sacrament, but through the sacrament He awakened faith, which asked and obtained the promises of God. Thus the body and blood of Christ were not according to them, the inward part of the sacrament, or God's gift through it; but they were supposed to be given with a view to produce a further result, faith. The body and blood of Christ were, according to them, not gifts *to* faith, but gifts to excite faith. They were *only* means to an end beyond themselves. The Zwinglians, then, rightly urged, “All other places of the Confession wherein the sacraments are treated of, confirm our opinion, “and manifestly exclude that of the Lutherans or Ubiquitarians. For “the thirteenth article stands thus: Of the use of the sacraments, “they teach that sacraments were instituted, not only to be tokens “of profession between men, but rather to be signs and witnesses of “God's will towards us, set forth to excite and confirm faith in those “who use them.” *The Doctrine of the Real Presence, Notes, &c.*, pp. 37, 38.

50. In taking leave of Canon Liddon, we cannot but remark that however egregiously the Dean of Arches misrepresented the teaching of Bertram and Ælfric in main-

taining that they held no other Eucharistic doctrine than that held by Mr Bennett, he is quite right in claiming Canon Liddon as one who holds the very same doctrine ; but then he might just as well have adduced a doctor of the Roman Church for a witness.

51. Another witness whom the Dean of Arches cites, and who also teaches the same doctrine as Mr Bennett, he introduces as follows : ‘ I cannot more fitly conclude this catalogue than by a reference to the high authority of the present Bishop of Salisbury, Dr Moberly, who, in one of his ‘ Bampton Lectures, observes upon the Holy Eucharist as follows :

‘ 52. “ In order to constitute its complete character according to the divine pattern of its institution.” For the remainder of the passage, as cited by the Dean of Arches but with additional context, see chapter xii. 84.

53. The Dean further cites, ‘ *“ The simple doctrine of the real, and as in our modern mode of speech we call it, the objective presence of the body and blood of Christ.”* And then this learned prelate adds the following words which deserve the most careful attention, both from the great weight due to the authority which uttered them, and from their bearing upon the present case :—

‘ 54. “ *I will therefore only say that the ancient doctrine of the Church, and, as I read it, the unquestionable doctrine of the Church of England, is that the spiritual presence of the body and blood of our Lord in the Holy Communion is objective and real. I do not see how we can consent, as with Hooker and Waterland, to limit authoritatively that presence to the heart of the receiver ; for the words of the institution (and these are cases in which we are rigidly and absolutely bound to the exact words of the revelation), the words, I say, of the Lord in the institution, seem to forbid such a gloss.*” —(pp. 67, 68.)

55. We have already shown in chapter xii. 84-93, how egregiously Bishop Moberly has misunderstood not only the general testimony of antiquity, but also that of his own chosen witness respecting the absolutely exclusive right of the bishop or presbyter to administer the Lord’s Supper.

We shall now point out a still more grievous error, and one fraught with the most disastrous consequences to his own Church. He actually makes the validity of the Lord's Supper and the gift of the Holy Ghost to depend upon an order of men which has no existence excepting in the imagination of a few high Anglicans. He speaks of 'bishops as 'the personal successors of the apostles.' (p. 203.) He also says, 'The distinction to be taken and continually observed 'between the ultimate possession of spiritual power and 'authority, and the organic instrumentality provided to 'administer it. It will be observed that while the ultimate 'possession is with the Church at large, the representative 'organs of the Church derive their personal authority to teach 'and their right to be esteemed representative of the Church 'in that regard, not from any act of election or empowerment 'done by the whole Church, but directly from the gift of 'God, which first constituted the apostles themselves and 'then those to whom they delivered the succession of the like 'authority.' (p. 95.)

56. The ultimate possession of spiritual power and authority which the Bishop says is with the Church at large, he in an earlier part of his book correctly bases upon the teaching of Cyprian and Augustine. He says, 'In like manner we believe, 'with St Cyprian and St Augustine, that when Christ promised to St Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, He 'promised them to the Church at large.' (p. 47.) But when Bishop Moberly makes his distinction between the possession of spiritual power, and the organic instrumentality provided to administer it, he not only flatly contradicts the plain teaching of Cyprian and Augustine, and that of all antiquity, but nullifies what he has recognized them as teaching, namely, that Christ through Peter promised the keys to the Church at large, and that therefore the ultimate possession of spiritual power and authority is with the church. Whence should the spiritual power be derived but from the source where it is lodged, that is, the visible body of the faithful. These above named illustrious African Fathers make the church not only the depositors of spiritual power but the dispensers of it too. Bishop Moberly correctly enough accepts their testimony in the

first particular, but plainly rejects it in the other. These great African doctors of the church distinctly teach that bishops do not confer the keys of spiritual power and authority on bishops, but that the bishops receive them from the church, and have no right to dispense them, inasmuch as they believe that the church has the keys in respect of origin and virtue—the bishops only in respect of use. Having fully gone into an examination of this subject in the work named ‘Whose Are The ‘Fathers?’ and more concisely in a treatise, ‘On The Primitive ‘Mode Of Making Bishops,’ the reader is referred to those sources for additional information. We cannot but notice, in passing, that what has been accepted by a few High Anglicans as evidence of the modern theory, or their private opinion of apostolical succession, is contemptibly weak and worthless. For a full examination and refutation of it the reader is again referred to the above named work, ‘Whose Are The Fathers?’

57. We shall now examine the Bishop’s declaration respecting what he believes to be the doctrine of the Church of England, as cited by the Dean of Arches, and which forms section 54 above. This is a truly self-contradictory testimony. Let the reader note well how the Bishop, to use his own words, ‘rigidly and absolutely’ binds Hooker and Waterland to the exact words of institution. He yet further adds in addition to what the Dean has cited, ‘I said that this is a case in which ‘we are rigidly and absolutely bound to the exact words of the ‘revelation. . . . Thus reported [by “the three Evangelists ‘“and St Paul,”] and thus especially revealed, the holy words ‘must be understood to convey exactly, neither more nor less, ‘that which they say ; and that which they say on this sacred ‘mystery is precisely, neither more nor less, that which God ‘has told, and that which man knows.’ (pp. 163, 164.) Now both Hooker and Waterland deny that there is any presence of Christ’s body and blood in the consecrated elements. Bishop Moberly, then, to prove that there is the real objective presence of Christ’s body and blood in the elements, insists on the words of institution being understood in the way which he requires. The words so understood doubtless teach his doctrine. Of bread Christ says, ‘This is my body which is given for you.’ The body was real and objective too. Of wine Christ said,

‘This is my blood which is shed for you.’ The blood was also real and objective too. But does the Bishop himself accept the words of institution after the manner in which he requires others to accept them? Most certainly not. He in fact puts upon them what may be called a Marcionite and Valentinian gloss, for it should be well observed that he does not contend for a real and objective presence simply, which, if the words are taken as he requires, without doubt teach, but for a real and objective *spiritual* presence, which if the words are taken as he requires they most certainly do not teach. Our blessed Saviour did not say of bread, ‘This is my *spiritual* body which is given for you.’ ‘This wine is my *spiritual* blood which is shed for you.’ We are certain that Christ did not give a *spiritual* body to be crucified, nor was the blood which was shed *spiritual* blood, although certain ancient heretics once did so believe.

58. Bishop Moberly, in the same citation, says, ‘The *unquestionable* doctrine of the Church of England, is that the ‘spiritual presence of the body and blood of our Lord [upon ‘the elements of bread and wine, p. 67,] in the holy communion is objective and real.’ Could the Bishop really believe his own statement? and could the Dean of Arches accept it as true when almost in the same breath the Bishop shows that this Paschasian doctrine was so far from being unquestionable with such representative men as Hooker and Waterland, that they plainly deny it as he himself admits. It appears very unaccountable that such a witness as this, who is really an accomplice in doctrine with the accused Mr Bennett, should have been brought forward by the Dean of Arches, and introduced too with words of commendation as Homer introduced his heroes. Let the reader well consider what is the burden of the testimony of this witness so introduced. ‘The ‘unquestionable doctrine of the Church of England is that the ‘spiritual presence of the body and blood of our Lord [upon ‘the elements of bread and wine] in the Holy Communion is ‘OBJECTIVE and real!!!’

59. Perhaps it may be said that Bishop Moberly, since the Dean of Arches cited him in the defence of the heresy of Mr Bennett, has changed his opinion on that point, inasmuch as

he has published another edition of his lectures, and has substituted the word 'true' for the word 'objective.' He has not, however, changed his opinion, although he has changed his words. Why he has made this change, he states as follows: 'I have omitted the word "objective," which in the first edition stood in this place, on the ground, whether the grace of the Holy Eucharist come to our souls by and through the elements or no, alike it is objective, as coming to us from without ourselves, and having existence independently of our own thought. Everybody holds the presence to be "objective," except the merest Zwinglian.' (p. 163.) We naturally ask if this little word is so inoffensive to sound doctrine as the Bishop here represents, why in all the world did he replace it by another? Beyond all question, the reasons which he has given for its removal ought to have caused its retention. Surely the Bishop must have had some reason for its removal, which he has not revealed. The Dean of Arches has given a very correct meaning of the word as follows: 'The phrase *objective* presence would be used, I presume, to mean that the presence of Christ is mysteriously but really, in the consecrated elements apart from the act of reception by the communicant.' (p. 69.) And Dr Pusey in his recent sermon (1871) has given us its origin and use in relation to the sacrament as follows: 'Finding that the words "real presence," were often understood of what is in fact a "real absence," we added the word "objective," not as wishing to obtrude on others a term of modern philosophy, but to express that the life-giving body, the reality or thing of the sacrament, is, by virtue of the consecration, present without us.' (35 74.) Assuredly Bishop Moberly ought to have changed his entire teaching on the doctrine of the real presence, or to have kept to the word objective, which well defines it. It must be confessed, however, that the Bishop's statement, as now amended, of what the doctrine of the Church of England is as touching the real presence, is greatly different from his former statement, as cited by the Dean of Arches. As cited by the Dean, it was 'The unquestionable doctrine of the Church of England is, that the spiritual presence of the body and blood of our Lord in the Holy Communion is OBJECTIVE and real;' as amended, the same

presence is said to be '*true* and real.' The statement unamended would make the Church a holder of the Paschasian heresy, and of course that of Mr Bennett too, but as amended, that doctrine is not only unexpressed, but is understood to be denied, or as Dr Pusey says, 'is understood of what is in fact a 'real absence,' (35 74,) that is a 'real absence' of that which the Paschasians and Dr Pusey, in particular, believed to be present in the consecrated elements. The phrase as amended expresses substantially the doctrine of the Church in the language of the Reformers. All believed that there was a *spiritual* presence of Christ in the Holy Communion, and especially Zwingli, but the very use of the word spiritual as defining the presence was introduced as a denial of that presence commonly held by all the disciples of Paschasius. Dr Pusey then has truly said, 'The words "real [spiritual] presence," were 'often understood of what is in fact a "real absence,"' that is a real absence of the body which was born of Mary, and the blood which was shed by the soldier's spear, from the consecrated elements. We have supplied the word 'spiritual' in the above extract as more accurately representing the real state of the case.

22

6
105-

of

[Handwritten signature]



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01030 8049